

OTES OF A  
UDY OF THE  
PRELIMINARY  
CHAPTERS OF  
THE  
MAHABHARATA

NOTES OF A STUDY OF THE PRELIMINARY CHAPTERS  
OF

# THE MAHABHARATA,

Being an attempt to separate genuine  
from spurious matter.

BY  
V. V. IYER,  
NELLÖRE.

BY  
V. VENKATACHELLAM IYER,  
High Court Vakil, Nellore.



PRINTED BY  
V. RAMASWAMY SASTRULU & SONS.  
292, ESPLANADE, MADRAS.  
1922.  
*All Rights Reserved.*

# NOTES OF A STUDY OF THE PRELIMINARY CHAPTERS

OF

## THE MAHABHARATA.

Being an attempt to separate genuine  
from spurious matter.

BY

V. VENKATACHELLAM IYER,

High Court Yakil, Nellore.

PRINTED BY

V. RAMASWAMI SASTRULU & SONS,

292, ESPLANADE, MADRAS.

1922

*All Rights Reserved.*

## PREFACE.

The manuscript of this book was almost ready about the time that the great war broke out. The author was then advised that as prices showed a tendency to go up beyond what was tolerable, it would be less expensive to undertake the publication after the close of the war, which, at that time, was expected to come about much sooner than it actually did. The author acted on this advice and he has since found that it was very unfortunate that he did so. Shortly after the close of the war, it became clear to the author that it was not desirable to delay the publication any longer. In attempting to revise the manuscript for publication with a view to amend, correct and improve, the writer found that he had lost touch with the work. On account of this and of vocational work limiting his spare time, he was not able to give the book a satisfactory revision. The book is however placed before the public with its demerits unredeemed, yet with the hope of a kind reception.

NELLORE,  
*November, 1921.*

} THE AUTHOR.

# CONTENTS.

## BOOK I

### Chapter I.

Available printed editions of the Mahabharata noticed—Extensive variation among them—A critical study of the text necessary—The Bharata a sort of Encyclopædia—What was its original form? Was it the work of one man or one period? Not possible to answer—Present day efforts at a critical study; author's apology for his appearance—Puranic preamble of the Bharata—Recited not by the Suta but by his son.

### Chapter II.

The Sauti introduces himself to Saunaka and the Rishis, and offers to recite stories to them—The patriarch wishes to hear the Bharata story...The sauti is willing—The Sauti gives to understand that the poem is already ancient—Brahmins as repositories of this learning—Vyasa's composition of the Bharata—An ancient census of the Gods—Brief and extended versions—Where the Bharata should be taken to commence—Brahma (the Creator) pays a visit to Vyasa to recommend the God Ganesa as amanuensis—Their conversation—Bharata at start no more than a Kavyam—The Bharata described by metaphor as a tree—Ganesa writes to Vyasa's dictation—Articles of agreement between them—The truth about the 8800 hard nuts—What was the text copied by Ganesa?

### Chapter III.

Brahma's panegyric on the Bharata...Tree metaphor...corruption of the text...Bharata origins...Vyasa's Magnum Opus of 60 lakhs of verses...Its distribution...only one lakh for mortals...First public recital of the Bharata at Janamejaya's Sarpa-yaga...What became of Ganesa's copy?...The extent in volume of the Bharata...The Sauti retains in memory a hundred thousand verses by hearing them recited but once.

### Chapters IV—V.

Another tree—metaphor...A synopsis of Bharata events, of some early period...text considerably changed since then...Synopsis suggests Pandu's accidental death, even after going to forest...Pro-



creation of the Pandavas subsequent to Pandu's death...Synopsis discussed.

### Chapter VI.

The synopsis as to the life of the Pandavas at the capital... A large portion of the text not referred to in the synopsis.

### Chapter VII.

More of the synopsis...The Digvijaya of Arjuna preparatory to Rajasuya...The Rajasuya...Synopsis leaves out important episodes, between the nuptials of Draupadi and the Rajasuya...More of the synopsis...No reference to the entirety of Vanaparva and Virataparva incidents...Discussion.

### Chapter VIII.

The तदनांशे series, an interpolation...Discussion...Some significant omissions in the series, such as the slaying of Hidimba and Bakasura...Close of the series with the war, suggestive...The last seven Books not touched on in the series...The Dyuta...and Punardyuta as noticed in the series...Punardyuta an after-thought...Kichaka...Vadha not noticed in the series, as also Jayadratha's abduction of Draupadi.

### Chapter IX.

Consolation (?) administered by Sanjaya to Dhritarashtra...Benedictory verses suggesting the compilation of the first chapter long after the finish of the Bharata...The title of the 1st chapter as Anukramanikadhyayam, misnomer...The Bharata exalted above the Vedas...Weighed in the balance, Vedas found wanting...An easy road to salvation.

### Chapter X.

Telugu poetical translation of the Mahabharata introduced...Some notice of the authors, and their method...The work of the earliest of the translators only important for this study...Telugu ignorant of Brahma's visit to Vyasa or of Ganesa's function as scribe...Summary of the results of a critical study of the first chapter.

## BOOK II

### Chapter I.

Some idea given of the plan of the second chapter...Cantoos designated in this study as Antahparvas...The Bharata as the 'Gesta

Romanorum' of Indian poets and dramatists...Second chapter must have been written long after finish of Bharata...Number of cantoos as actually enumerated is 130. Enumeration falsely wound up with 100 as the number of cantoos...Discussion...Some absurdities in the Sauti's speech...The Harivamsa, a lost appendix.

### Chapter II.

The Postscripts introduced...Further discussion of the number of the cantoos...One hundred, the orthodox traditional number...Possible suggestions examined.

### Chapter III.

Further discussion about the number of cantoos-Names of Parvas in the Preliminary enumeration i.e. Parvanukramanika compared and contrasted with the names as given in the postscripts...Variations in the several editions and Telugu text referred to...The cantoos as grouped into the Books examined...The non-existence of some where they ought to be found pointed out.

### Chapter IV.

Note...that the preliminary enumeration of cantoos discussed in chapters I, II, III, next above is the real Parvanukramanika...Motive for misnaming the first chapter suggested...Method of the Telugu rendering of the second chapter explained...Telugu enumerates only 100 cantoos not 130. Variations in the enumeration between the Sanskrit text and the Telugu...How to account for this variation...Summary of discussion...The verification at the end of the Preliminary enumeration discussed...Summary of results of the discussion of the Preliminary enumeration.

### Chapter V.

The third section of the second chapter, known as the Parvasangraha taken up for study...Method of this section, as also of the corresponding Telugu explained...The Parvasangraha of the first Book or Adiparva...Omission of mention of Advaitavataharanam...Its place discussed...Variation in the name...Is it Advaitavataharanam or Vamsavataharanam? Discussion...Matter of some cantoos not noticed in the Parvasangraha...Some cantoos amplified...Stories told more than once.

### Chapter VI.

Parvasangraha of first Book continued...Two Upakhyanam  
Yayati and Sakuntala change places in the editions...Neither men-  
tioned in the Preliminary enumeration...Yayati copied from Mat-  
syapuram...Yayati not noticed in the Parvasangraha...Much other  
matter not alluded to in the Sangraha...Several topics repeated.

### Chapter VII.

The Sangraha for the second Book of the Bharata. *Sabha-  
parva* notice meagre...Doubtful topics and chapters ..Dyutaparva  
introduced...*Draupadivastrapaharanam*, as popularly known,  
taken up for discussion, though beyond the writer's programme,  
to ascertain how much or how little of it the first cast of the  
Bharata should have really contained, and to show that the  
miracle of Krishna's interference is a falsehood of later invention.

### Chapter VIII.

Variations of text and sequence...The second Book affording a  
typical instance of such...Details given...Summary of results of the  
study of the Parvasangraha for the second Book.

### Chapter IX

The Parvasangraha for the third Book or *Vanaparva*...  
Canto titles more numerous and less vague than in other cases...  
Details ample...Kimmiravadha...The Akshayapatra...Arjuna  
goes to Indrakila to make Tapas...Debates in the Council—  
chamber at the capital...The Salwopakhyanam, a counter blast  
to Tripurasuravadha...Arjuna's visit to and sojourn in Indra-  
loka, a breach of the articles...Canto of Tirthayātraparva exten-  
sively manipulated...Discussion...Several chapters of Tirthayatra  
copied from Padmapuranam...Several of Agastyopakhyanam,  
interpolated...Some chapters of Agastyopakhyanam copied from Pad-  
mapuranam...Sagaropakhyanam, no reference in Parvasangraha, in-  
terpolation...Parvasangraha recognition for some more upakhyanam  
wanting; as also for Yudhishtira's ascent of mount Kailasa...The  
Saugandhika quest reiterated under another name...Yudhishtira's  
reception by Kubera (Plutus) not mentioned in the Parvasangraha...  
Second and third visits of Arjuna to Indraloka not noticed in Parva-  
sangraha...The riddles of the Python-reiterated in another form.

Markandeyasamasya, a doubtful canto; a string of upakhyanam,  
several of which not named in the Parvasangraha...Pativrata-mah-  
atmyam-identity of...discussed...The Dharmavyadha chapters, no  
authority, for...The pedigree of the Agnis (Fire-Gods), and Skando-  
pakhyanam, interpolations...The Prayopavesana chapters, no  
authority for, either in the Preliminary enumeration or Parvasan-  
graha...Mrigaswapnodbhava, an Æsop's fable...The Ramopak-  
hayanam...The Savitryupakhyanam, an interpolation from the  
Matsya (and Skanda) Purana...Story of Karna's birth not warranted  
by the references, an oft-told tale...The riddles of a Yaksha, re-  
petition of the Ajagaram idea...Variance of sequence noted...Some  
upakhyanam named for the fifth Book found here...Results of the  
discussion of the Parvasangraha for the third Book.

## BOOK III

### Chapter I.

Canto-titles and Parvasangraha detail of the fourth Book  
studied...This Book re-written and re-modelled at some period...  
Superstitious reverence for this Book...The story of the slaughter  
of the Upakichakas, an interpolation...Variance in the editions of the  
order in which the Pandavas present themselves for service to  
king Virata...Canto-title and Parvasangraha detail of the fifth-  
Book, *Udyoga-parva*, examined...Some cantoes intended for this  
Book not found...An upakhyanam about Indra's adventures therein  
interpolated...Kunti's interview with Karna not referred to in  
Parvasangraha...So also that of the Sun-God.

### Chapter II.

Canto-titles and Sangraha detail of the sixth Book...*Bhishma-  
parva* examined...The canto of Bhishmabhishechanam intended for  
this Book is found in the fifth...Method devised by Vyasa for a con-  
temporaneous record of the events of the war...The Bhagavat-gita  
obtained at fifth hand...Bhishma's death on the battle-field con-  
verted into a wounded existence by Bharata specialists...The  
Jambukhandavinirmanaparva and Bhumiparva together form a  
treatise on geography...The former copied from the Padma-  
purana...The Bhagavadgita, not mentioned by that name...Krishna

rushes out to kill Bhishma but is restrained...This idea repeated...  
Summary of the results of the discussion about this Book.

The *Dronaparva* or the seventh Book...Karna makes up his quarrel with Bhishma...This Book includes some upakhyanams not stated in the Preliminary enumeration or the Parvasangraha—Vyasa appears and recounts to Yudhishtira the upakhyanam of the sixteen kings of ancient history, quite without authority in the Parvasangraha.

### Chapter III.

Discussion of the eighth Book, *Karnaparva*...Doubtful origins...The entire Book only one canto...Tripurupakhyanam, not mentioned in the Preliminary enumeration...The fable of the swan and the crow...Extensive variations of readings...Kavya metre and style developed...Changes of sequence of chapters and incidents.

The ninth Book, *Salyaparva*—Titles discussed...Canto of Gadayuddham changes place...The Saraswataparva again records accounts of places of pilgrimage...The adventures of Kumara, the son-God again.

The tenth Book, *Saṁptikaparva*—Titles...Jalapradanikam canto named for this Book shifted to the next by Bharata scholars...Discussion of some incidents of the eleventh Book as relevant to the discussion about Jalapradanikam...Absurdity of the invention that the Royal women were taken to the battle-field to weep...Motives for shifting the place of Jalapradanikam discussed...Postscripts speak false.

The eleventh Book *Strīparva*...Titles discussed...Postscripts false in designating first canto as Jalapradanikam...Some chapters of this Book shifted to the next...Visit of the Royal ladies to the battle-field not referred to in Telugu Parvasangraha...Change of sequence...Discussion...The iron Bhimasena...Result of the discussion about this Book.

### Chapter IV.

The twelfth Book, *Saṁtīparva*...Detail meagre...Preliminary enumeration given eight cantos of which only three found in postscripts...What became of the other cantos?...Yudhishtira's jermade invented to provide an excuse for the twelfth Book...Sermons spun out...Several chapters found in the Dravida not found in the

Calcutta copy...The thirteenth Book, *Anusasaniaparva*,—of same tenour as the twelfth...Dravida contains one hundred chapters more than other editions...Extensive variations in the location of the chapters...Results summarised.

### Chapter V.

The fourteenth Book or the *Aswamedhaparva*...overdone by revisers...Anugitaparva a continuation of the Bhagavadgita idea...Dravida includes in this Book an interpolation, Vaishnavadharmaparva, not found elsewhere...Cantos wrongly emplaced...Postscripts false...The fifteenth Book or *Asramavasaparva*...The beginning of the end...Vyasa conjures up a vision of the dead...Janamejaya's scepticism...Yudhishtira's trip to the forest not referred to in the Parvasangraha...Parvasangraha note for this Book that Yudhishtira learnt of the Mausala incidents from Narada finds no corresponding matter in the text in this Book or next.

### Chapter VI.

The *Mausalaparva*, the sixteenth...Book...Yudhishtira's information from rumour...Mutual extermination of the Yadavas...Exit of Balarama and Krishna, whether at the tavern or not, not clear...Daruka's report to Yudhishtira...Arjuna's journey to Dwaraka...Contradictions between Parvasangraha and text...Probability that the Mausalaparva was at one time the closing chapter of the fifteenth Book.

The seventeenth Book, named *Mahaprasthanikam*...Journey from this to the next world, accompanied by a dog...A canto indicated for the next Book placed in this, being the canto in which it is recorded that Yudhishtira goes up in the flesh to Heaven in a chariot let down for the purpose by Indra...The eighteenth Book, the last, named *Swargarohanam*...Yudhishtira meets Duryodhana and others in Swarga...Vents his spleen...Vision of Hell...The epic brought to a close...The Telugu Parvasangraha for seventeenth and eighteenth Books compared with corresponding Sanskrit...Telugu gives no justification of Yudhishtira's ascent to Heaven or the dog...Second chapter closes with account of religious merits obtained by a study of the Bharata...Some passages show that second chapter must have been compiled long after Bharata collated.

## BOOK IV.

### Chapter I.

Scheme of the Parvasangraha again described...Second chapter again taken up for the study of the calculations therein given of Adhyayas and slokas in the eighteen Books, as also of the verifications and colophons at the end of the Parvasangraha for each book suggesting authorship...Comparative table showing arithmetical totals of cantoes, chapters, and slokas as recorded in the Parvasangraha (Sanskrit and Telugu) as also the actuals obtained by calculation in the case of each of the Bombay, Calcutta and Dravida copies...Vyasa's authorship of each of the eighteen Books as disclosed in the Parvasangraha discussed...Several of the Books, the work of Bharata specialists...Indications that Vyasa's Bharata at one time closed with the eleventh Book...Result of the discussion...Alberuni's list of the eighteen Books of the Bharata excerpted for comparative study...Important variations, commented on.

### Chapter II.

Study of chapter 59, a short one of ten verses...Disclosure that it was Vyasa (not Vaisampayana) that narrated Bharata story to Janamejaya.

Chapter 60...Vyasa, required by the king to tell the Bharata story, turns abruptly to Vaisampayana and directs him to tell the story...Direction confined to story of the war...Last seven Books without authority...Vyasa does not tell the King that a poem had been composed and that Ganesa copied it...Chapter 61...contains a summary of the Bharata story...This summary compared with those in chapters 1 and 2 and commented on...Inferences suggested...Interpolation of Arjuna's matrimonial adventure in Pandyanad.

### Chapter III.

Chapter 62...contains statements that the extent of Bharata is of two thousand chapters, comprising one hundred thousand slokas, distributed among one hundred cantoes, allocated to eighteen Books...Those figures compared with those given in the second Adhyaya...The fallacy about the lakh of slokas explained...A further statement that Vyasa composed the poem in three years time...(No reference to the Magnum Opus of 60 lakhs, or to Ganesa); that Vyasa taught

the Bharata to several of his pupils; that each one of them composed a separate Bharata on his own account...Probability that these works were absorbed into the present Mahabharata...Chapters 61 and 62 were probably prefatory chapters of some Bharata or Bharatas.

### Chapters IV.

A study of Astikaparva and of the question 'Was the Bharata recited at Janamejaya's serpent-sacrifice?' Impossibility of the incident shown.

## APPENDIX I.

- (1) Pandu's fatal mistake...Explanation on foot of an astronomical myth of the incident of Kindama Rishi and his wife as Buck and Doe, and of Pandu's death in his wife's embrace.
- (2) The wounded Bhishma on the stretcher waiting for the Uttarayanam—another astronomical myth.
- (3) The sacred number 18 connected with the Bharata.  
Explained as ritualistic formalism.

## APPENDIX II.

### Draupadi and her five husbands.

A study of the justifications invented in the Bharata and some Puranas for this polyandrous marriage, while conceding that the marriage was opposed to law and usage.

### Chapter I.

## INTRODUCTORY.

### Chapter II.

First attempt at an explanation, contained in chapter 184 (Dravida) of the Adiparva, (First Book), stated and commented on.

### Chapter III.

Second attempt at explanation—as the story of a Nalayani, stated and commented on. Found only in the southern texts. Third attempt, being a revised version of the same Nalayani story. Not found in the other texts. Second version stated.

### Chapter IV.

Statement of second version of Nalayani story brought to a close. Examination of the story and comment thereon.

**Chapter V.**

Fourth attempt. The Panchendropakhyanam. Relation of story. Some comment on the story.

**Chapter VI.**

Comparison of the Sanskrit form of the story with that found in the Telugu translation—Discussion and comment.

**Chapter VII.**

Precedents cited in the text of ancient instances of Polyandrous marriages. Fifth attempt, a re-iteration in slightly altered language of number 1 story (C. 184), found at the close of Panchendropakhyanam. Reason for the repetition suggested. Attempts in the Dravida text to concatenate these several stories and represent them as appertaining to one and the same individual. All these stories, the work of Vyasa, as one of the Dramatis Personæ at first and as the author of the Bharata later.

**Chapter VIII.**

Concatenation of the stotries. Discussion and proof that Nalayani is not the woman found weeping in the river.

**Chapter IX.**

Concluding portion of the Panchendropakhyanam noticed and discussed...The absurdity of the attempt to piece together the several stories as the narrative of the life-Story of one individual demonstrated...General remarks.

**Chapter X.**

Puranic attempts to solve the Draupadi mystery...General remarks...Solutions offered by the Markandeyapurana, the Brahma-vaivartapurana, and the Devi-Bhagavathapurana, quoted and discussed...Concluding remarks.

**NOTES OF A STUDY OF THE PRELIMINARY CHAPTERS**

OF

**THE MAHABHARATA**

अग्निर्लङ्घित एव वानरभटैः किन्त्वस्य गंभीरताम् ।

आपातालनिमग्नपीवरतनु जानाति मन्थाचलः ॥

**BOOK I.****CHAPTER I.**

There are several editions of the complete text of the Mahabharata, as now extant, available in India. Among them I wish to make mention of (1) Protap Chunder Roy's edition printed in Calcutta between the years 1882-1890, which, on account of the low price at which it was made available to the general public, has been widely distributed. This edition will be referred to in these notes as the Calcutta edition. (2) An edition published about sixty years ago by some pandits at Madras in the Telugu character. This I shall call the Madras edition. (3) An edition issued by some pandits of Kumbakonam but printed in the Devanagari character at Bombay and published in 1906. This I shall speak of as the 'Dravida' text. (4) An edition issued by that enterprising firm of Booksellers and Publishers at Bombay, Messrs. Gopal Narayan & Co. This will be referred to as the Bombay edition.

Even a cursory examination of these copies discloses the fact that, though in the main they agree as to



the text of the epic, the divergence among them as to portions of the same is palpably great; much greater than it ought to have been or might have been if due solely to natural causes. No one text agrees with another in the number of slokas it gives. The sequence of the chapters is often found varied. The arrangement of matter differs, frequently, in respect of even individual chapters. Whole Adhyāyas or chapters, given in one edition, are looked for in vain in the others.

Variations of reading occur with annoying frequency.

Some of these editions are provided with commentaries. But the trouble is that the learned Scholiast's annotations are conspicuous by their absence just when they are badly wanted and the notes occur at rare intervals. Commentators are probably the same everywhere. And what the poet Young said of those in the west, that they 'each dark passage shun and hold their farthing candle to the Sun' is equally true of these in the East. Where the purport of a passage is not apparent, the commentary is, not infrequently, an attempt to extract from the lines a meaning that they cannot bear, by forcing the context or the construction.

The careful student cannot fail to observe the literary styles of different epochs brought together, oftentimes, in the course of the same Adhyaya.

The artless simplicity of the early periods, the artificiality of the latest and the rhetorical flourishes of the mediæval period may be seen side by side in a strange combination in the course of the same chapter. To those who have, by the customary law of the

country, no access to the Vedas, the Bharata has been offered as a substitute. To those who have such access it is diligently inculcated that the Bharata is entitled to a higher place.

For over a millennium, it has been spoken of as the fifth Veda and in popular belief it has really been so regarded.

I should think, therefore, that a critical study of the text is a real necessity. Anything like criticism, was foreign to the methods, traditions and instincts of our commentators.

Sanskrit scholars who have had a liberal English or European education have opportunities of work in this field which the orthodox Pandits have not.

The Bharata as we now find it is an Encyclopædia treating of many subjects which have no connecting bond between them unless it be a note of interrogation by some inquisitive or querulous interlocutor.

You find in it what was offered as history, what was regarded as geography, what was believed to be religion, philosophy, polity, science and, in addition, several other topics of interest. Did the Bharata exist at the start in the form in which we now find it? Was it the work of one man or of one period?

The answers to these queries can only be very general, an infirmity arising from the nature of the subject and the utter absence of sources of information.

The answers may be very plausible but it would be impossible to attempt anything like specific detail or deductive certainty.

I understand that some learned bodies in Europe and India are engaged in an academic study of the Mahabharata, with a view to achieve, in some sort, a canonical reduction of the text to what may be surmised to have been its original proportions. But I have no information as to how far the work has progressed. Those learned bodies have at their command opportunities, materials and resources, denied by Providence to the present writer. And yet this study is offered to the public in the hope that it may go some way in lightening the labours of such academies.

Authors seeking the suffrages of the reading public in their favour ought also to be prepared to meet adverse criticism, and to take the same, if not with a good grace, at least without resentment; while criticism will not be less effective for being just and generous. With that consciousness and this expectation, this book is placed in the hands of the reader.

I hope it will be readily conceded that every attempt in this line of study should be welcomed, whether the results are approved or not. What is defective may be supplemented, what is erroneous may be corrected. The pioneer, who does no more than clear the road for his betters, discharges a very necessary, if not a very dignified function. Let us break the ice and not resign ourselves to the idea that to question the genuineness of a chapter in the Bharata is to question Providence.

The Bharata is introduced in true Puranic style. There is a conventional formula with which all Puranas open. The theory is that all the Puranas were of Vyasa's composition. But one and all of them were published through the recital by Suta to the Rishis of the Naimisha forest. We are told that a great number

of holy men lived in the hermitages of this forest. The Suta's recitals were invariably made to Saunaka, the patriarch of these clans. This Rishi was, once upon a time, engaged in a round of sacrifices which required a period of twelve years for its completion. This prolonged religious rite was the occasion for men and women of all sorts and conditions and idlers from far and near to come together in great numbers. Recreations and amusements had to be provided for this multitude. They loved gossip. The Suta was at hand. As a disciple of Vyasa, he had an inexhaustible knowledge of Puranic lore. He was therefore commissioned to recite to the assemblage the Puranas one after another. He did so.

This is the fable with which every Purana is pre-laced.

The Bharata also was of Vyasa's authorship. It was also recited to the guests and visitors assembled at Saunaka's sacrifice. It was, however, not recited by the Suta. It was his son that had this honour and privilege. The first chapter, therefore, opens with this introduction. But what became of the Suta himself? How is it that he did not recite the Bharata? Not one word is said about him. It is clear that when the Santi turned up his father was not by to commission the son to recite and to see how he would acquit himself. Did the audience tire of the Suta or he of them? He was the pupil of Vyasa and doubtless the Bharata was taught to him with the other Puranas. The son's qualification was certainly inferior. He had only heard the text recited and but once by Vaisampayana. The chances of error were certainly great. But

perhaps the Suta was dead. If that was so, it could not have been long after the Suta's death or disappearance that the Bharata was recited. For we are not told of two different Satrayagams &c.....

The preamble thus makes it clear that the Bharata was treated and regarded as a Purana. The circumstance that the narration was ascribed to the son of the Suta is suggestive of the fact that the composition of the Bharata was of a later period than that of the Puranas or, at any rate, of the earlier of them. 'Suta' is not a proper name. It was the name of a sub-caste or half-caste which came into existence when caste had not yet stratified and mixed marriages were allowed or suffered. The Sutas were the offspring in the first instance of a Brahmin woman and a Kshatriya partner. Their chief vocation would appear to have been story-telling. They went about as wandering minstrels, 'troubadours' or rhapsodists. They went through life as a favoured class.

We are not to take seriously the interposition of the Sauti (son of the Suta). He had no more to do with the Bharata than the 'latest minstrel of the age,' 'who sang' Sir Walter Scott's immortal Lay, had to do with the latter.

## CHAPTER II.

When the Sauti made his appearance at Saunaka's place, he was welcomed warmly. In reply to a query as to where-from he hailed, he tells the Rishis that, after listening to the recital of the Mahabharata by Vaisampayana to Janamejaya, he went out on a pilgrimage to several sacred places. The last station he

visited was Samanta Panchaka—an extensive champaign land, where the battle field of Kurukshetra was placed. These he visited and from there took his way to Saunaka's hermitage.

He offered his humble service to the Rishis and inquired of them what they liked to hear. They wished to hear the Mahabharata recited.

सौतिः—“ भवन्त आसने स्वस्था ब्रवीमि किमहम् द्विजाः ।

पुराण संश्रिताः पुण्याः कथा धर्मार्थसंश्रिताः ॥

ऋषय ऊचुः । द्वैपायनेन यत्प्रोक्तं पुराणम् परमर्षिणा ।

सुरैर् ब्रह्मर्षिभिश्चैव श्रुत्वा यदभिपूजितम् ॥

तस्याख्यानवरिष्ठस्य विचित्रपदपर्वणः ।

सूक्ष्मार्थन्याययुक्तस्य वेदार्थैर् भूषितस्य च ॥

भारतस्येतिहासस्य पुण्याम् ग्रन्थार्थसंयुताम् ।

संस्कारोपगताम् ब्राह्मीम् नानाशास्त्रोपबृंहिताम् ॥

जनमेजयस्य याम्प्राज्ञो वैशंपायन उक्तवान् ।

यथावत्सऋषिः पृष्ट स्सत्रे द्वैपायनाज्ञया ॥

वेदैश्चतुर्भिस्संयुक्ताम् व्यासस्यादृत कर्मणः ।

संहिताम् श्रोतुं मिच्छामः पुण्याम् पापभयापहाम् ॥

आदि-१...१५...२१.

The Sauti:—“ Holy fathers! Now that I see you all comfortably seated, what shall I recite to you. Tales from the Puranas of secular and religious interest?

The Rishis:—“ Let us have the Purana told by Vyasa.....that which the gods and Brahma Rishis heard and praised; that best of stories with its well-turned phrases and progressive chapters; that which is

embellished with the truths of the Vedas and is pregnant with hidden meaning; we are very anxious to hear the poem of Bharata, the Itihasa, with its flow of perfected language and its profusion of Shastric knowledge. Let us have it as the King Janamejaya had it from the lips of Vaisampayana, even as the latter was questioned and recited. Let us hear that sacred poem, which is the embodiment of the four Vedas and will be very helpful to our salvation."

It is clear that the Puranas had been in vogue before the Bharata was known. Also that the Bharata was regarded and spoken of as a 'Purana' or what is the same thing an 'Itihasa.'

How the Rishis came to describe a poem they had not heard recited before, in such eulogistic terms, has not been explained. The only epithets used by the Sauti, when he told the Rishis at the outset that he set out on a pilgrimage, after he had listened to the recital of the Bharata by Vaisampayana, were

**सुपुण्याः, विविधाः, विचित्रार्थाः**

"Full of virtue, varied, of curious and pleasing subjects or import." If the Rishis had heard the Bharata recited before, they should have said so, but they did not. The epithets used by them would have been justified only in the utterance of one who had a personal knowledge of the subject.

This passage was doubtless manipulated.

The Sauti, in reply, after pronouncing a benediction, says he will recite the Bharata to them.

**प्रवक्ष्यामि मतम् पुण्यम् व्यासस्यादु तत्कर्मणः. आदि-१...२५**

He adds what is significant :—

**आचक्षुः कवयः केचित् संप्रत्याचक्षते परे।**

**आख्यास्यन्ति तथैवान्ये इतिहास मिमम् भुवि ॥ आदि-१...२६**

'I shall proceed to narrate the version of Vyasa of wonderful works. Other poets (before me) have sung this story, others are doing so now, and, sure enough, yet others will do so hereafter.'

The Sauti having stated that he would recite the Bharata, we should expect him to make a start. The Rishis asked for it. They were on the tip-toe of expectation. But the wonder is that the Bharata is not commenced until we pass over about 250 pages of matter (as printed in the Calcutta edition).

The intervening portion has, on any rational basis, no connection with the narrative or the subject of the Bharata. It represents the successful assiduity of interpolators of various periods.

The reference by the Sauti to previous recitals of the Itihasa by poets, before his time, calls for remark. The only recital known up to the time of the Sauti's observation was that by Vaisampayana, who was commissioned to publish it in Janamejaya's court by Vyasa. It does not appear that there were any recitals before that. Vyasa's teaching of the Bharata to the pupils of his school cannot be brought within the purview of the Sautis' reference. The publication, which will be referred to lower down, of the Bharata among the gods and demi-gods was not of this Bharata—that is the Bharata of Vaisampayana. Who then were the poets who preceded the Sauti in the recital of the Bharata? Who

were the poets reciting the Bharata in his own time to whom he refers as his contemporaries? How was their knowledge acquired? But it is not clear that the Sauti intended to speak of a recital of the Bharata by others past, present and future. The Sauti's utterance is capable of meaning something else that is more probable: that the story of the Bharata was the theme of several distinct poems by different authors, before him and in his time, and that he was sure it would be so in the future also.

We have several Ramayanas and it is very probable that there were several Bharatas also. If that was so, the Sauti's speech clearly points to the probability of several versions of the Bharata having been in vogue before the present text was consolidated by collation. Except on this supposition the Sauti's reference is a positive anachronism.

What follows is equally suggestive.

The Sauti :—

“इदन्तु त्रिषु लोकेषु महज्ज्ञानम् प्रतिष्ठितम् ।

विस्तरैश्च समासैश्च धार्यते यादृजातिभिः ” आदि-१...२७

“ This great knowledge, treasured extensively by the Brahmins, in full or in brief, is established in all the three worlds.”

Where was the time for the Brahmins, presumably a large number, to treasure up a knowledge of the Bharata in the interval between Vaisampayana's recitation and the Sauti's appearance at Saunaka's place? Who taught the Bharata? Were any copies made and multiplied?

The first line is doubtless an exaggeration, but, let us try to extract its meaning.

The knowledge which was so extensively established was identical with that mastered by the Brahmins, who, of course, lived on this planet. But their text was only that which was recited by Vaisampayana. It was therefore this text that got established in the three worlds. But this presupposes that sometime must have elapsed from Vaisampayana's performance, some reasonable time, for the efficient and extensive dissemination of this knowledge.

We may make sure, therefore, that a considerable period of time must have elapsed between the first publication of the original Bharata and the preparation of this introduction.

At this point the Dravida text has admitted some lines which I shall set out below.

‘तपसा ब्रह्मचर्येण व्यस्य वेदम् सनातनम् ।

इतिहास मिमम् चक्रे पुरा सत्यवतीसुतः ॥

आदि-९

पुण्ये हिमवतः पादे मेध्ये गिरिगुहालये ।

विशोध्य देहम् धर्मात्मा धर्मसंस्तरमाश्रितः ॥

३८

शुचि स्सनियमो व्यासः शान्तात्मा तपसि स्थितः ।

भारतस्येतिहासस्य धर्मेणान्वीक्ष्य तां गतिम् ।

प्रविश्य योगम् ज्ञानेन सोऽपश्यत् सर्वमन्ततः ॥

१४

‘By the accumulated merit of his Tapas and his strict observance of celibacy, Vyasa, having succeeded in redacting the Vedas, composed this holy Itihasa. On the sacred slopes of the Himalayas, in the recess of a sanctified cave, the virtuous Rishi, set about cleansing.



his body, and then seated himself on a mat of the sacred Kusa grass in all his purity and with full control on his self, with his mind free from care and distraction. He went into Tapas and, by Yogic introspection and inspiration, he discovered the whole course of events of the Bharata and from within he saw all.'

The first two lines of this extract are found in the other editions also, though not in this context. But the other lines are not found in the Calcutta, Madras or Bombay editions. In the Dravida text itself these lines are marked as doubtful.

Here is a fair example of how easily important emendations of the text can be made on the sly.

The first two lines record two events of Vyasa's literary work. One that he redacted the Vedas and the other that he composed the Bharata. No information is given about the period of time when these events took place. We know, however, that the Vedas were redacted in the Kritayuga; and we have been informed, elsewhere, that the Bharata was composed after the close of the Dwapara-Yuga and after all the Bharata heroes had passed on to Eternity. The interval, then, between the redaction of the Vedas and the composition of the Bharata must have been considerable. For, we have to take into account the unexpired portion of the Krita-Yuga, as to the exact extent of which we have no information, as also the whole of the Treta-Yuga (1,296,000 years) and the whole of the Dwapara-yuga (864,000 years). The first two lines noted above lend themselves, however, to a construction implying the close chronological contiguity in sequence of the two events. Was that really

intended by the author of the verse? The spurious lines, next following, found in the Dravida, are calculated to strengthen the suspicion. If the intendment really was to state that the Bharata was composed soon after the Vedas were redacted, it reveals a stupendous idea :—That Vyasa exhibited his ability and completed his merit by the redaction of the Vedas in the Krita-Yuga and, soon after, seated himself in the fulness of his virtue to forecast and prophesy the train of events which, towards the close of the Dwapara-Yuga (or the third), manifested themselves in the life-history of the Pandavas and the Kauravas.

This would be a daring attempt to heighten the sanctity and antiquity of the Bharata, by bringing it into a line with the Ramayana, as to which a similar legend was concocted by later writers to the effect that the Ramayana had been composed before Rama was born. It would, however, be safer to regard that so much was probably not intended. Let us proceed.

Without any prelude we are introduced to an account of the origins of the universe and the first creation. This passage, a pretty long one, is in Puranic fashion, is thoroughly irrelevant and is not wanted by the context. I wish to be excused for referring to a few items of interest in this passage.

We are told that the sons of Daksha were 7 and the Prajapatis with whom they were associated were 21.

We find also the tale of the Gods stated at 33 thousands, 33 hundreds and 33.

Lower down, a fanciful genealogy is given, in which one Subhrat had three sons, Dasajyotish, Satajyotish and

Sahasrajyotish. And again, Dasajyotish had ten thousand sons, Satajyotish had one hundred thousand and Sahasrajyotish had one million sons. This numerous brood were the authors of all mankind.

Students of J. F. Hewitts' History and Chronology of the Myth-making-age will easily recognise the moral behind these figures.

The 7 sons of Daksha with their 21 Prajapatis are suggestive of the 7 days of the week and the 21 days of the month of the seventeen-months-year.

The number of the gods as given above is a fanciful multiple of the figure 33. The result is 36333. The census of the gods must have been taken in the period when they reckoned 33 days to the month and 363 days to the year. The rate of increase of the population in God-land must have been appallingly great; for, a few generations later, the gods multiplied into 33 crores. The three sons of Subhrat are the solar years of the three-years-cycle-year as is apparent from the manipulation of the figure 10, the number of the lunar months to each of the four periods of this cycle-year.

The three sons are represented by the number 10 and its multiples. The case is the same as to their offspring. The excuse for this genealogy is found in the sequel that all the Kshatriya tribes, including the Kurus, are descended from those above. The intermediate steps however have not been traced.

The further narrative from this point takes a turn back to Vyasa.

भूतस्थानानि सर्वाणि रहस्यम् त्रिविधं च यत् ।

वेदायोग स्तविज्ञाना धर्मोर्थः काम एव च ॥

धर्मकामादियुक्तानि शास्त्राणि विविधानि च ।

लोकेयात्रा विधानञ्च सर्वम् तदृष्टवानृषिः ॥

इतिहासा स्सहव्याख्या विविधाः श्रुतयोपि च ।

इह सर्वं मनुक्रान्तं मुक्तम् ग्रन्थस्य लक्षणम् ॥

आदि-१...४८...५०

"The Rishi saw the origins of the elements, the secret of three sorts; the Vedas and Yoga with esoteric developments; Dharma, Artha and Kama; the several shastras treating of Dharma, Artha and Kama; the Puranas with commentaries and the several Srutis."

The last line stands without any grammatical connection with the foregoing and with a complement wanting. It may be rendered thus:— 'the ground that has been covered (in the foregoing lines) sets out the nature of the work (the Bharata).' Then follow verses which require some scrutiny.

विस्तीर्यैतं नमहज्ज्ञानम् ऋषि रसंक्षिप्य चाब्रवीत् ।

इष्टम् हि विदुषाम् लोके समासव्यासधारणम् ॥

मन्वादि भारतम् केचिदास्तीकादि तथापरे ।

तथो परिचराद्यन्ये विप्रा स्सम्यगधीयते ॥

विविधम् संहिताज्ञानम् दीपयन्ति मनीषिणः ।

व्याख्यातुम् कुशलाः केचित् ग्रन्थान् धारयितुम् परे ॥

आदि-१...४८

"Having elaborated all this knowledge and having also abridged the same, the Rishi said:— 'The learned like to have expanded and abridged treatment.'

'The Brahmins have studied the Bharata sedulously, some from the chapter about Manu, others from the

chapter about Astika, yet others from the chapter about Uparicharavasu.'

'The learned display varied intellectual abilities in dealing with literature. Some are good at commenting on a work, others in getting up the text by heart.'

It seems to me that the second of these verses, which I shall presently show to be an important one, has no place here. It appears to have been taken out of its context somewhere else and wedged in here, probably by accident.

It has no connection with the idea either of the foregoing verse or of the succeeding one, which both ought to stand together in sequence, as the idea of the one runs on into the other and will be found pursued and explained in the latter.

The statement in the first verse, that the Rishi both elaborated and abbreviated his knowledge, is somewhat of a paradox, which, however, is sought to be justified by the Rishi's observation which is another paradox. The solution is to be found in the third verse. Why or how do the learned like an expanded and an abridged treatment? Because of the difference in capacity. Some are good only in commenting. It is these that prefer an expanded treatment. But others are only good with a verbal memory. They can only learn by rote. It is they that prefer a shortened version. It is probable that the third verse and the first stood together at one time, that the whole of the third verse also was a continuation of Vyasa's observation noted in the first. In Sanskrit books reported speech is not indicated by any device of punctuation and mistakes may be easily made. These

two verses were designed to account for a phenomenon of frequent recurrence in the text of the Bharata as now extant. Some topics are found repeated twice or three times without a proper excuse beyond the unsatisfied curiosity of an interlocutor; and they are repeated with colouring and embellishments for which reasons may be found. This treatment would require justification. This is supplied by the supposed observation of Vyasa.

The second verse of the above extract embodies a note on the real commencement of the Bharata.

At some early period, even before this first chapter was compiled, doubts or misgivings would appear to have been entertained as to where the text of the Bharata really began. This could have been possible only at a stage when, by the admission into the text of interpolations, the original form had been altered and some measure of confusion introduced.

Some maintained that the text should be taken to commence from some chapter close to where the start of the epic could be logically placed. Others preferred to push it back as far as they could with decency or plausibility.

The starting points noted are three. The first is मन्वादि or the chapter about Manu. The editors of the Dravida text suggest that 'Manu' here means a *mantram* or incantation. This they claim to be the benedictory verse with which the first chapter that we are now studying commences. This interpretation is expedient in securing for the present text the genuineness of all the matter which, as I have stated above, is found

printed on the first 250 pages, as numbered in the Calcutta edition—matter which has really no connection with the Bharata at all. But it is difficult to accept this suggestion. Manu here seems to be a personal name, doubtless, of the great Manu. Taking it with the other two names, which are admittedly personal names, we may be certain that 'Manu' here was the foundation—Manu, if I may say so. But what is his connection with the initial chapter of the Bharata?

Turning over the leaves, we find that on page 261 of the Calcutta edition commences a chapter, the 95th in that edition, in which the genealogy of the Pandus and the Kurus is traced from Manu, the first man, down to Janamejaya to whom the narration is made, and down again to his offspring also. This chapter is in prose, except for a few prefatory verses in metre, supplied by the compilers, to make it appear that this chapter is a continuation of what now stands before it. That the chapter runs in prose, as one of the few instances by way of exception to the rest of the text, is a matter requiring notice. Its grammatical peculiarities, awkward syntax and certain archaic forms of expression, taken with the fact that it is done in prose, mark it as a composition of an early period. The chapter, after narrating the generations from Manu down to the Pandus and the Kauravas, gives a brief summary of the events of the Pandava history up to the espousals of Draupadi. It then proceeds to record facts, not widely known, that each of the Pandu brothers had other wives also and children by them. Except in this chapter, this tradition cannot be found in the Bharata. It was evidently not thought desirable to give it more publicity.

That this chapter was the first or second of a version of some Bharata known at one time is very probable, from the blessings invoked on those who read or hear it read and, in particular, from the closing sentences set out here below.

परमूहीदम् भारतम् भगवता व्यासेन प्रोक्तम् पावनम् ।  
 ये ब्राह्मणादयो वर्णाः श्रद्धावानाः अमत्सराः वेदसंपन्नाः  
 श्रोष्यन्ति तेऽपि स्वर्गजितः सुकृतिनः अशोच्याः  
 कृताकृते भवन्ति-भवति चात्र श्लोकः ।  
 इदम् हि वेदैः स्मृतम् पवित्रं मपि चोत्तमम् ।  
 धन्यम् यश्चैतन्मायुष्यम् श्रोतव्यं नियतात्मभिः ॥

आदि ९५...८९.

"This Bharata has been narrated by Vyasa and is purifying. Those of the Brahmin and other castes, who hear it with attention and faith, they are indeed blessed; they attain to heaven without leaving a regret behind them as to what they may have done (in life) or left undone. And here runs a Verse in point:—'This (the Bharata) is coeval with the Vedas, is purifying and most perfect; it blesses you, adds to your renown and longevity. Therefore should you hear it, as a religious act.'"

This passage, we need not doubt, must have been conceived as a prologue to the actual start of the epic. If the text of the Bharata stood as we now find it, throughout all the periods of antiquity, there was no need to be told in the 95th chapter that the poem was of Vyasa's authorship and of equal sanctity with the Veda.

There can be no doubt that some version of the Bharata must have been headed off with this chapter.

Where it now stands in the present text, it is of a piece with what follows, and all the previous chapters may be ignored without causing any violence to the consistency or continuity of the story, and without leaving anything to be desired.

Let us pass on to Astika—The episode in which he figures as the hero is a tale which has nothing to do with the Bharata. It occupies 48 pages of printed matter in the Calcutta edition and extends over 25 chapters from the 34th to the 58th inclusive. The substance of it is briefly told. Janamejaya had started the Sarpayagam or the great sacrifice at which thousands of serpents were immolated. Astika was the son of a snake-wife begotten by a Brahmin. It had been foretold that Janamejaya would start the snake-sacrifice and that the same would be brought to an untimely termination by the intervention of Astika. When the time for it came, he was implored to intervene by his snake-cousins of the gens of his mother. He did so and Janamejaya abandoned the further sacrifice.

It was to this Janamejaya that the Bharata was recited by Vaisampayana, when the sacrifice was in progress, in the intervals of rest allowed by the ritualistic programme. Astika's appearance was towards the close of this sacrifice. It is impossible, therefore, that the episode of Astika or of the snake-sacrifice should have had anything to do with the Bharata of Vyasa. Again, the period of Janamejaya's sacrifice cannot be placed earlier than a century after the expiry of all the

Dramatic personæ of the Bharata, whose fortunes good and bad formed the subject of Vyasa's epic.

In tacit recognition of this fact, the chapters about Astika with several others, before and after, are shown in the text not as the recitation by Vaisampayana but as the Śauti's own narration.

It is difficult to appreciate the propriety of starting the Bharata with the story of Astika. But it is conceivable that the idea should have been advanced or maintained, after the canto had been successfully prefixed to some text of the Bharata; its exclusion would imply an admission that it was an interpolation, whereas its inclusion might enable it to pass muster with the other work ascribed to Vyasa.

The account of Uparicharavasu is a solar myth, rather transparent in character. The compilers have managed to connect him, in a remote and perhaps left-handed way, with the Pandus and Kurus. This episode is found in the Calcutta edition as Chapter 63. In it is found the great event of Vyasa's birth, as the result of love or rather lust at first sight.

There may be some excuse for connecting this episode with the beginnings of the text of Vyasa's Bharata, leaving out of account the impropriety or indelicacy of Vyasa himself narrating the love passages between his youthful maiden mother and an amorous dotard of a Rishi. But it is impossible to hold that the Bharata, as we now find it, starts with this chapter; for, we have to skip more than a hundred pages of irrelevant matter, next succeeding, before we come to the true beginning.



It is probable that, at one time, this chapter about Uparicharavasu was prefixed to the Bharata, to serve as an introductory account of the birth of its supposed author.

I hope it is sufficiently shown that the second of the three verses set out above has no connection with the other two. This verse comes in too early in the chapter, if it ever formed a portion of it, to read consistently with the context.

Wherever it should be placed, it would be intelligible only if we conceive that there were several versions known before the present redaction, and that they varied as to the first chapter, by reason of interpolations having been admitted.

Next follow three lines which state that after the redaction of the Vedas, Vyasa composed the Bharata. At this point we find considerable divergence in the sequence of the verses between the Dravida text and the other editions. The reason will unfold itself as we proceed.

The Calcutta and the other editions introduce the visit of Brahma, immediately after we are told that Vyasa had finished composing the Bharata:—

तदाख्यानवरिष्ठम् स कृत्वा द्वैपायनः प्रभुः ।

कथमध्यापयानीह शिष्यानित्यन्वचिन्तयत् ।

तस्यतच्चिन्तितम् ज्ञात्वा ऋषे द्वैपायनस्य च ।

तत्राजगाम भगवान् ब्रह्मा लोकगुरुस्त्वयम् ॥ आदि १...५५.

‘Vyasa having completed that best of stories was taking thought as to how best he could train his dis-

ciples to learn it; discovering what passed in the mind of the Rishi, Brahma, the father of the Universe, came down himself to see the Rishi.’

Next above these lines and next below the three lines recording the composition of the Bharata by Vyasa, after the redaction of the Vedas, the Dravida text publishes about ten verses, which are found set out lower down in the other editions—that is, after the conversation between Brahma and the Rishi is concluded, after the account of Ganesa’s penmanship is finished and after a panegyric on the Bharata is passed.

I shall proceed according to the Calcutta text.

The advent of Brahma was contrived on the analogy of the Ramayana where Brahma manifests himself to Valmiki to encourage him in his resolve to compose the Ramayana and to vouchsafe to him the necessary inspiration. The temporal, if not the spiritual, advantage of ushering the Bharata into publicity under the sponsorship of the Creator of the Universe is self-evident and requires no explanation.

The Rishi (Vyasa) gives Brahma an idea of the work composed by him. The description gives Brahma to understand that the work was a sort of encyclopædia of religious, philosophical and social topics: of Puranic, astronomical and scientific matter: of formal logic and discourses on the physical features of the earth: in short, of every thing sacred and profane, with a little added of what was really germane to the subject, namely, the history of the Bharata heroes.

It is clear that the compilers regarded the epic portion of the work as of a very subordinate character, a

mere peg on which to hang their religious and didactic sermons.

Vyasa concludes his speech with this appeal to the Divine visitor—

‘परम् न लेखकः कश्चिदस्मै भुवि विद्यते ।’

‘The only circumstance causing me anxiety is that there is no one in this world who is competent to write it to dictation.’

His grievance was probably genuine.

It is worthy of note that Vyasa introduces the Bharata to the God in these words.

कृतम् मयेदम् भगवन् काव्यम् परमपूजितम् ।

“My lord, I have composed this *Kavya*, which is universally respected (or deserving of great respect.)” पूजितम् is the passive participle. The idea implied in this word is not easy to render. If understood literally, it means ‘worshipped’; secondarily, ‘respected,’ ‘sanctified,’ ‘worthy of respect.’

Brahma says “I know that from your birth you have spoken nothing but the truth. As you have chosen to style your work a *Kavya*, be it so. This *Kavya* shall never be excelled by the work of any other poet. Think of Ganesa for the copying of this *Kavya*.” This said, the Great one disappeared. (In the Calcutta and Madras texts-but not so in the Dravida).

This passage gives some side-lights of which we may avail ourselves. Vyasa’s description of the Bharata, addressed to Brahma, puts it on the footing of an encyclopædia of all existing knowledge, sacred and profane.

If that were the original form of the poem it were a misnomer to call it a *Kavya*. But Vyasa claimed for it no higher place than that of a *Kavya*. The original work could have made no pretensions to a higher status than that of a *Kavya*. This makes it almost certain that the proportions of the first work could have had no comparison with the present magnitude of the Bharata.

The *Kavya* character of the original must have survived in tradition even after it had been done entirely out of shape.

The compilers knew very well that it was absurd to give *their* Bharata the name of a *Kavya*.

To ease their minds, Brahma interposes with the facetious remark that he would let the designation of *Kavya* subsist. Out of regard for Vyasa’s constant love of truth, he would not contradict the Rishi, though, in this particular, it rather appeared that his modesty prevailed.

We should also bear in mind that an epic poem like the Bharata, which belonged to the first ages of poetry, could not have been designed and would not have had any excuse for being designed as an encyclopædia.

I have to draw the reader’s attention to another variation in the arrangement of matter at this point.

In the Calcutta and Madras texts, the reply of Brahma is a short one. It is couched in three verses and a hemistich, the latter suggesting that Ganesa should be asked to act as the amanuensis; this said, the

direction is 'exit Brahma'. But in the Dravida text Brahma's reply does not conclude here. Below the third verse the reply extends over ten verses; of these the first two are marked as doubtful and they are not to be found in the other editions. The other eight verses are accepted as canonical. They are found in the other copies, not however, in this context, but lower down after Ganesa's visit; nor as the speech of Brahma but as the Sauti's own matter. At the end of the tenth verse in the Dravida edition, the hemistich about Ganesa is placed, winding up the reply of Brahma, after which He vanishes. In these verses, fathered on Brahma, the Bharata is extolled with an unsparing use of metaphor and simile, of epithet and ornament, couched in long-winded phrases. The Bharata is also, by metaphor, represented as a tree; the several Parvas or Books of the Bharata are the trunk, the branches, the foliage the flowers and the fruit of this wonderful tree.

The revisors of the text in the south went one better than their fellow-labourers in the north in accrediting this panegyric to the speech of Brahma. The advantage of having a foreword from the Creator of Gods and men is very obvious.

These verses are cast in a very artificial and comparatively modern style. It was too much even for the Sauti's best manner.

There is great difficulty in accepting this eulogium (it may have been deserved for all that) as part of Brahma's speech.

Vyasa did not tell Brahma any thing about the

Parva division of the Bharata nor give him the least indication of its existence. It is doubtful if Vyasa had by the time of this interview made this division himself, mentally. At all events there is no information about it. How or why Brahma should have started a descriptive detail of the Parvas is not clear, unless it is to be explained by his omniscience as the Creator of the Universe. If that was so, Vyasa's lecture to him about his literary work might have been spared.

The enumeration of the Parvas in the tree-metaphor is defective. Probably the metaphor was exhausted before the omitted books could have been mentioned. Some place might have been devised for them in the extensive ramifications of this tree. It is singular that the Anusasana Parva is not mentioned. It is the thirteenth book, in the existing texts, and one of the most extensive forgeries smuggled into the Bharata. In the Dravida text it comprises over eleven thousand verses. It was certainly not an inconsiderable or negligible branch of this huge tree.

An explanation may be forthcoming that it must be taken to have been included in the previous book. Perhaps so. But may we ask, why so?

The enumeration ends with the Book named Mausala-Parva, the sixteenth of the collection; the incidents of which have hardly any connection with the Bharata. The last two Books of the present text, the Mahaprasthanika and the Swargarohana have been left out without mention. They are small Books no doubt, each less in extent than some of the individual chapters in the other Books of the Bharata. But the moral signi-

ficance of these Books is very great. Here you find the finish of the Bharata and the exit of the Pandavas from this world; also the passage of Yudhishtira to Hades, en route to Heaven, after the most approved classic models.

We have no means of ascertaining at what period this first chapter was compiled, nor whether the Books omitted in the enumeration formed portions of the text known to the compiler.

Nor have we any means of knowing when this tree-metaphor was slipped into this chapter.

Did the last two Parvas exist at all in the first instance or were they conceived as a postscript to supply the complement of a fitting conclusion. If they existed in the earlier periods, did they form a portion of the Mausala Parva as its closing chapters? If so, when were they granted an independent existence?

Let us go back to the Calcutta text. We were told above that Vyasa had composed the whole poem mentally and was looking for a scribe or amanuensis. Brahma suggested Ganesa for this office. The Rishi, accordingly, thought of him and on the instant the pot-bellied and elephant-headed god appeared before him. The physical form of this god was certainly not a point in his favour, at any rate, in view of the function of rapid stylography. The stipulation on the part of the god was that the divine scribe should write on, provided the poet dictated as fast as the god wrote. There was also a counter-article agreed upon in the interest of the poet, that the god should not write down anything that

he did not understand. This, it seems, was stipulated for, to enable the poet to dictate a hard verse here and there, so that Ganesa should get stranded in attempting to make out the meaning; and before he could start again, the Rishi composed a good many verses which he dictated as rapidly as the god wished.

We are told that Vyasa said that in this manner he interspersed as many as 8800 verses into the text of his dictation, verses which sorely taxed the acumen of Ganesa.

Vyasa is also reported to have said that the meaning of these verses was known only to himself and to his son Suka, but that it was doubtful whether Sanjaya knew the same.

When did Vyasa say this? We are not told. The mention of Sanjaya in this connection is inexplicable. His name is not mentioned in the list of pupils to whom Vyasa taught the Bharata. If Sanjaya stood so high as to deserve honourable mention by Vyasa in connection with the understanding of these 8800 verses, it is surprising that his name should not have been included in the roll of pupils, privileged to learn the Bharata at first hand. We are not told anywhere that Sanjaya studied the Bharata at all.

The Sauti claims that the 8800 verses are still imbedded in the text, and that it is not possible to make them yield-up their import.

The length in verses of the text copied by Ganesa is a matter that has to be taken notice of. There are .

some lines in this chapter recording the tale of the verses of the Bharata. Here again we find fresh trouble. These lines occur in different places of the chapter in the Dravida and Calcutta versions. For the present let the reader take it that the text copied by Ganesa was one either of 24000 verses or 100,000. The probability is in favour of the figure 24000.

Let us now proceed to examine the data about the 8800 verses. The whole thing sounds like a tale that it really is. But it is however contradictory of the recital above, that Vyasa had the whole poem ready composed for dictation. If that was so, there was no need for any device to gain time to compose. It looks rather as if the Rishi composed while he dictated, as rhapsodists do.

Where these 8800 verses are to be found in the text is an enigma. They do not exist except in the invention of the compiler of this chapter. Verses passing the comprehension of ordinary human intelligence, much less of divine, are not to be met with in the text. No commentator has marked these verses or offered any clue by which they could be identified.

Where then are these verses to be found? Echo answers, where? The Bharata has been translated into the more progressive vernacular dialects and it does not appear that the translators came across these verses. It is singular that if these verses existed in the text they should not have caused a pause or surprise to the audience, either of Vaisampayana or of the Sauti. Evidently the listeners found no difficulty in following the recital. If they did, they would have stopped the

reciters and asked for the meaning of the verses, even if they did not get it, before they allowed the narrative to be resumed. But there is not a single instance of any such interruption. It is conceivable that Vaisampayana or the Sauti after him should have recited parrot-like; but it is not conceivable that the audience should have held their tongues when they were treated to a dessert of Ganesa's hard nuts.

If Ganesa's text was of 100,000 verses, the average hiatus was at the end of every ten or eleven verses, indicating a rather halting flow of inspiration for one who was a Rishi and an Avatar and who badly wanted a divine short-hand-writer. But I shall presently show that Ganesa's text was of 24000 verses. If that was so, it betrays a lamentable want of capacity on the part of the Rishi as he must have come to a stand-still at the end of every two or three verses.

Again, we are to assume that the Rishi, who was at a loss for a verse following in sense and order, was able to compose, on the spur of the moment and by a collateral mental effort, a verse or two which the divine Ganesa should require to construe like a school boy.

It seems to me that we have to read between the lines to gather the real meaning of this episode about the 8800 verses.

It is probable that the original of the Bharata comprised only 8800 verses as the total extent of the poem; and that this fact survived in tradition for some time after its progressive expansion under the auspices



of interpolators. The situation had to be reviewed and some story had to be invented to explain away the traditional notion, a task rendered easy by the lapse of time.

The fable was then invented that the number 8800 referred only to the hard nuts given to the elephant-headed god to crack. The Deus ex machina was conveniently brought in for this purpose.

In view of the fact that the poem was represented as having been in its origins a Kavya and the fact that we are justified in comparing it with similar works of genius in other parts of the world, of the heroic ages, the tale of 8800 verses does not err on the side of brevity and may be allowed as probable.

### CHAPTER III.

From this episode we pass on in the Calcutta edition, to the panegyric on the Bharata and the tree-metaphor, both of which have been put into the mouth of Brahma in the Dravida text, where they appear in advance.

We next find a verse which is strangely out of its place in all the copies.

तस्य वृक्षस्य वक्ष्यामि शाखापुष्प फलोदयम् ।  
स्वादुमेध्य रसोपेत मच्छोद्य समरैरपि ॥

आदि १...९३.

“I shall proceed to describe the branches, flowers and fruit of that tree”.

The Sauti, however, does nothing of the kind in the verses following, in which we find recounted the genesis of the Bharata and its elaborations.

In the Dravida text this verse is set in more indefensible environments. I have only to set out one verse before and one after to show this:—

सर्वज्ञोपि गणेशोयत् क्षणमास्ते विचारयन् ।  
तावच्चकार व्यासोपि श्लोकानन्यान् बहून्पि ।  
तस्य वृक्षस्य वक्ष्यामि शाखापुष्पफलोदयम् ।  
स्वादुमेध्यरसोपेत मच्छोद्य समरै रपि ।  
अनुक्रमणिकाध्यायम् वृत्तान्तम् सर्वपर्वणाम् ।  
इदम् द्वैपायनः पूर्वम् पुत्रमध्यापयच्छुक्रम् ॥

“Ganesa, though he was omniscient as a god, had on such occasions to think for a while to understand the meaning of the verse dictated to him. Vyasa thus managed to gain time and composed many new verses in the interval” “I shall proceed to describe the branches, flowers and fruits of that tree”. “Vyasa compiled a chapter of the contents of all the books. And this, of old, Vyasa taught to his son”.

It will be seen from the above that the second passage has absolutely no connection with what is found before it or after it.

When the Sauti speaks of *that* tree, what tree is it? Where is the antecedent of this pronoun to be found? I do not think it is in accord with the accident of any tongue, Sanskrit or other, to make a reference like this. The verses preceding are, as stated above, those in which the tree-metaphor with its trunk and

branches, flowers and fruit, sprigs and sprays, had been fully developed. It is unmeaning therefore to find this verse here. It ought properly to have been placed at the head of the verses dealing with this metaphor. The last verse of that passage is:—

सर्वेषाम् कविमुख्यानां सुपजीव्यो भविष्यति ।

पर्जन्य इव भूतानां मक्षयो भारतद्रुमः ॥ आदि १...१२

“The immortal Bharata-tree will afford a living to all poets and learned men (through all the ages), even as the rain-cloud (bestows the life-giving water) to all living organisms on this earth.”

It seems to me that this verse, now the last of that passage, ought to stand as the first and the other verse, that we are now discussing ‘तस्यवृक्षस्य’ etc. ought to follow as the second verse, and then the rest of the passage in which the metaphor is developed should find its proper place.

Next follows the passage about the genesis of the Bharata and the count of its verses. This passage, as I have stated before, occurs far in advance in the Dravida text, before Brahma is introduced. We find it in the Calcutta and Madras copies after Brahma has come and gone, after Ganesa has finished his copy and gone back to his place, and after the expansion of the tree-metaphor. (The reference to the frequent variations of reading has become a painful necessity, causing perhaps some confusion and considerable annoyance to the reader as to the present writer, but it cannot be helped).

Verses 94 to 107 of the Calcutta Edition:—

मातुर्नियोगाद्धर्मात्मा गाङ्गेयस्यच धीमतः ।

क्षेत्रे विचित्रवीर्यस्य कृष्णद्वैपायनः पुरा ।

त्री नग्नीनिव कौरव्यान् जनयामास वीर्यवान् ॥ ९४

उत्पाद्य धृतराष्ट्रं च पाण्डुम् विदुरमेव च ।

जगाम तपसे धीमान् पुनरेवाश्रममुपगच्छति ॥ ९५

तेषु जातेषु वृद्धेषु गतेषु परमाम् गतिम् ।

अब्रवीद्भारतम् लोके भानुषेस्मि न्महानृषिः ॥ ९६

जनेभ्योजयेन् पृष्टस्सन् ब्राह्मणैश्च सहस्रशः ।

शशास शिष्यमासीनम् वैशम्पायनमन्तिके ॥ ९७

स सदस्यै स्सहासीनः श्रावयामास भारतम् ।

कर्मान्तरेषु यज्ञस्य चोद्यमानः पुनःपुनः ॥ ९८

विस्तरम् कुरुवंशस्य गांधार्या धर्मशीलताम् ।

क्षत्तुःप्रज्ञाम् धृतिम् कुन्त्या स्सम्यक् द्वैपायनोब्रवीत् ॥ ९९

वासुदेवस्य माहात्म्यम् पाण्डवानां च सत्यताम् ।

दुर्वृत्तम् धार्तराष्ट्राणां मुक्तवान् भगवानृषिः ॥ १००

चतुर्विंशति साहस्रानि चक्रे भारतसंहिताम् ।

उपाख्यानैर्विना तावत् प्रोच्यते भारतम् बुधैः ॥ १०१

ततोध्यर्धशतम्भूयस्संक्षेपम् कृतवानृषिः ।

अनुक्रमणिकाध्यायम् वृत्तान्तानाम् सपर्वणाम् ॥ १०२

इदम् द्वैपायनः पूर्वम् पुत्रमध्यापयत् शुक्रम् ।

ततोऽन्येभ्यो नुरुपेभ्यः शिष्येभ्यः प्रददौ विभुः ॥ १०३

षष्टिम् शतसहस्राणि चकारान्याम् स संहिताम् ।

त्रिशंछत् सहस्रं च देवलोके प्रतिष्ठितम् ॥ १०४

पित्रे पंचदश प्रोक्तम् गन्धर्वेषु चतुर्विंश ।

एकम् शतसहस्रन्तु मानुषेषु प्रतिष्ठितम् ॥ १०५

नारदो श्रावयद्देवा नसितो देवलः पितॄन् ।

गन्धर्वयक्षरक्षांसि श्रावयामासवै शुक्रः ॥

१०६

अस्मिंस्तु मानुषे लोके वैशम्पायन उक्तवान् ।

शिष्यो व्यासस्य धर्मात्मा सर्ववेदविदाम्बरः ॥

१०७

एकम् शतसहस्रन्तु मयोक्तम् वै निबोधत ।

(a) Verses 94 to 98 (Calcutta edition). I shall set out the substance: "By the command of his mother and of the wise Bhishma, the virtuous Vyasa procreated on the widows of Vichitravirya three sons, Dhritarashtra, Pandu and Vidura. Thereafter he betook himself to his forest-home for the practice of austerities. After these named had passed out of this world, in the fulness of years, Vyasa spoke (uttered, or published) the Bharata in this land of man. Having been requested by Janamejaya and thousands of Brahmins, he commissioned his pupil Vaisampayana, who recited the Bharata to them, in the intervals of the sacrificial rites."

(b) "The expansion of the Pandava clan, the virtues of Gandhari, the wisdom of Vidura, the fortitude of Kunti, these the Rishi Vyasa told well." 99.

(c) "The Greatness of Vasudeva (Krishna), the truthfulness of the Pandavas and the wickedness of their cousins, the sons of Dhritarashtra, these also the holy Vyasa recounted." 100.

(d) "(He) composed the Bharata of 24000 verses. The learned say that this is the extent of the Bharata without the upakhyanas." 101.

(e) "And then he compiled a chapter of 150 verses, setting out the contents of the several Books of the poem." 102.

(f) "This of old Vyasa taught to his son Suka and then he gave to others of his pupils whom he found apt and promising." 103.

(g) "Vyasa composed another poem (on the same subject) of 60 lakhs of verses. Of this work 30 lakhs were published in the world of the gods; 15 lakhs in the regions of the Pitris (departed ancestors). 14 lakhs were given to the Gandharvas, and one lakh was published among men." 104-105.

(h) "Narada recited to the Gods; Devala to the Pitris; Suka to the Gandharvas and other Daemones. In this land of man Vaisampayana recited, the pupil of Vyasa and the best of those learned in the Veda. Now listen to my recital of the lakh of verses." 106-107.

All these verses 94 to 107 run consecutively in the Calcutta, Bombay and Madras texts. We find them disjointed in the Dravida text, the corruption of which in this respect admits of demonstration.

Verses 94 to 102 rendered above, with the addition of one sloka not found in the other copies, are inserted in the Dravida text above the portion recording the visit of Brahma. The other verses 103 to 107 appear in that text after the episodes of Brahma and Ganesa have been passed; and to them we find prefixed, by repetition, the latter half of the 102nd verse which without the first half makes nonsense of the passage.

There can be no doubt that the episodes about Brahma, Ganesa and the tree-metaphor are interpol-

ations of a later date than even the original cast of the first chapter. In admitting these into the text, the revisers in the south would appear to have exercised their discretion as to where they should be placed. It was probably considered that the matter of verses 94 to 102, as giving some detail of the subject and the tale of the verses, would form a proper preamble to the introduction of Brahma on the tapis, and would be in perfect harmony with Vyasa's statement to the god that he had, ready-composed, the whole poem and was non-plussed for want of a copyist. With this idea the passage was split up, and Brahma brought in after what in the Calcutta text is verse 102. The other verses of this passage, left out, had therefore to be placed at the end of Ganesa's visit. To preserve the connection, so that the dislocation might not mar the meaning, the last verse corresponding to 102 had to be repeated. But, by bad handling or the error of the scribe, only the latter half is reproduced, which however makes no sense, by itself. For, this half of the distich is simply to this effect:—'The chapter of contents of all the books'. Taken with the first line left out here it is all right. That line says 'Vyasa composed in addition in 150 verses (the chapter of contents).' Where it stands for the second time in the Dravida text, this hemistich has necessarily to be read with the next following, which however would lead to an absurdity not contemplated. The next verse is to this effect. 'And this, of old, Vyasa taught to his son Suka'. It would leave one to think that what all Vyasa taught to his son Suka was 'this chapter of contents of fifty verses.'

The revisers in the southern districts probably reasoned that the narrative about the genesis of the poem, its subject matter and extent would be misplaced after the account of its reduction to writing and that, in introducing it to Brahma, some of that ground should be covered and it was awkward to traverse it again. The northern compilers may have thought that they would introduce the subject, in some measure, before Brahma's advent and give it more in detail later; it was not clear sailing anyhow. Now, let us proceed to study the passages set out:—

(a) It is clear that the first public recital of the Bharata is stated to have been to Janamejaya in the period of the sacrifice started by him; that the Bharata was composed as, in the natural course of events, it should have been, after all the heroes had passed away. But the text does not make it clear, as to who all had passed away before the Bharata was composed. The verse refers only to the senility and expiry of Dhritarashtra, Pandu and Vidura.

It appears that Vaisampayana had been previously taught the Bharata. About a hundred years had passed from the time when the last batch of the warriors, the Pandava brothers, had been taken up to heaven. Parikshit, the grandson of Arjuna, lived sixty years. Janamejaya, son of Parikshit, was probably about 50 years of age when he started the sacrifice. At what time after the death of the Pandus was the Bharata composed?

Why was it not published at the Court of Parikshit if it had been made ready in his time?

(b) & (c). We have here a brief view of the matter of the epic as recited to Janamejaya. It is thoroughly germane to the subject and quite consistent with inherent probabilities. We do not find here any outline of the Encyclopaedia unfolded before Brahma. Not one word about the Vedas, Sastras, Puranas and Science worked into the poem. It is apparent that the great topics detailed to Brahma, formed no portion of the text recited to Janamejaya. The probability of this suggestion is enhanced by what follows.

(d) It is stated that Vyasa composed the Bharata of 24000 verses. 'The learned recognised *that* as the correct extent of the Bharata minus the upakhyanas.' The latter therefore occupy three fourths of the text or about 75000 verses. These upakhyanas cover the entire ground of extraneous matter and comprise all the themes detailed by Vyasa to Brahma.

We are told positively that Vyasa's composition was of 24000 verses. We are not told positively, in this connection, that the upakhyanas were of Vyasa's authorship. We are left to infer it in the fanciful account given below of the compilation of 60 lakhs of verses.

At this point we find in the Dravida text a verse not known to the Calcuta or other texts. It reads thus:—

इदम् शतसहस्रन्तु श्लोकाणाम् पुण्यकर्मणाम् ।

उपाख्यानैस्सह ज्ञेयम् श्राव्यम् भारत मुत्तमम् ॥ .

"You should understand that the great Bharata, which every one should hear, is of the extent of one hundred thousand verses, inclusive of the upakhyanam

of holy men." This verse is placed immediately after (b) and (c) above, in which, however, no indication whatever of the upakhyanam can be found.

Below this verse is placed in the Dravida text the distich about the 24000 verses of Vyasa's composition. We may understand therefore that what was really claimed as Vyasa's composition was the measure of 24000 verses, and that the upakhyanam were not of Vyasa's Bharata but later additions.

*	*	*
*	*	*
*	*	*

(f) We are told that Vyasa taught this text of 24000 verses with the chapter of contents to his son Suka and some among his pupils. Let us recall to memory the statement that, before he set about teaching the text to his pupils, he wished that it should be reduced to writing.

It appears that he had composed the whole poem mentally and was casting about for ways and means to teach the same to his pupils, evidently, with the least trouble to himself. It was this difficulty of the poet that Brahma discovered by his omniscience. And it was to give advice in this matter that the great God condescended to manifest his presence in Vyasa's tabernacle.

Above the verses recording the visit of Brahma, we .

find placed in the Dravida text the lines avowing that Vyasa composed the Bharata of 24000 verses, also a preliminary chapter of contents, and that he was at a loss to determine how he should teach this mass of poetry to his pupils.

We may be certain, therefore, that it was this text of 24000 verses that Ganesa vouchsafed to copy.

It is curious that Ganesa is treated with scant courtesy. The last that we have been told of him is that he started writing and that every now and then he was confronted with some one of the 8800 verses and pulled up a bit. We are not told when he finished writing or whether he did so at all. A word of thanks or a compliment spoken by the Rishi would not have been out of place. Even the familiar courtesy of wishing *au revoir* has not transpired. The divinity of Ganesa, for all that he volunteered to act as scribe, deserved some better consideration.

The eloquent Sauti, with his lakh of verses, is silent about the fate of that precious manuscript of Ganesa's handwriting. We do not know whether Ganesa took it away with him or left it with the author. The latter is probable. What became of it? Was it lost by the pupils of Vyasa when they were entrusted with it for purposes of cram? Was it placed in the library of Janamejaya? It could not have been entrusted to better custody. And this disposal would have had the grace of a compliment next only to that of a positive dedication, for which probably he did not stand high enough in the author's estimation. Is it possible that, at least after having heard the poem

recited, Janamejaya should not have asked for the copy? And if he did, would it have been refused? If the manuscript had been got ready before the pupils were taught, why did not Vaisampayana read out from it to Janamejaya?

But what became of Ganesa's copy? Has it found its way into the British Museum?

There is not one word in the text about the subsequent fortunes of this manuscript or rather of the manuscript itself.

Let us proceed.

(g) and (h). Vyasa composed *another* work of 60 lakhs of verses of which 59 lakhs were appropriated to the gods, Pitris and Daemones; only one lakh was reserved for mortal men.

This gigantic text was *other than and distinct from the one referred to above*-that is, the text of which a copy was made by Ganesa.

If the version was completed in 60 lakhs of verses, the distribution of it in fractional shares would have given only mutilated and fragmentary texts, incomplete in themselves, each wanting all the others as complements.

But the lakh assigned to us is not only complete in itself but most painfully so. Are we to understand that there were several independent compilations of 30, 15, 14 lakhs and 1 lakh of verses, each self-contained and each treating of the identical subject of our Bharata? But the statement in the passage above is of only one text of 60 lakhs of verses.

Was the text of 60 lakhs committed to writing? Who wrote it? Was it Ganesa? We are not told.

Narada, Devala and Suka recited these texts in the several worlds. Did they commit this mass of poetry to memory or were they supplied with manuscript copies? When and how were these produced?

Vyasa had not the time or patience to teach the 24000 verses to the pupils in his seminary nor even to dictate it to them. If he had only done so several copies might have been made at one and the same time. He was doubtless pressed for time and wished to be accommodated with a divine short-hand writer.

Did the Rishi then manage to find the time or the stock of patience necessary to teach or dictate the 60 lakhs to Narada and his fellow graduates?

One lakh out of the sixty, a negligible fraction of the great work, was established in this world of ours, and recited to men by Vaisampayana, presumably on the occasion referred to above of Janamejaya's sacrifice.

The Sauti says he is about to recite this lakh of verses for the delectation of the congregation at Sauti's place.

It thus appears that the text recited to Janamejaya by Vaisampayana, and to the holy men of the Naimisha forest by the Sauti, was the fractional part of the huge text of 60 lakhs, distinguished as the *other compilation*, *अन्यसंहिता*. No that it had nothing to do with the smaller text of 24,000 verses, copied by Ganesa and taught by Vyasa to his son Suka and some others. But

it was not Suka's text that was recited to Janamejaya or published in this world. Suka no doubt did some recitation on his own account; but this was of 14 lakhs not of 24,000 nor of one lakh; and it was to the Dæmones and Rakshasas, not to the degenerate sons of the earth. For what purpose, then, was the first text prepared and poor Ganesa put to travail?

But we are told that the 24,000 verses of the first text plus the upakhyānams make up the total of one lakh of verses and, by connecting one recital with the other, we are required to understand that the combination set out above produces the lakh of Sauti or Vaisampayana, which is in itself the fractional one share out of the sixty of *the other* great work.

This is far from being satisfactory and not warranted by the premises. The recital about the Magnum Opus of Vyasa is a wretched attempt calculated to strike the reader dumb and stagger him with the presentation of inconceivable figures. The attempt is absurdly extravagant and we are fortunately relieved from a further examination of the detail by the circumstance that 59 lakhs were appropriated to other worlds than ours.

But the lakh that has been reserved for us is undoubtedly too heavy a load. It may have been light reading in the days of Vyasa if not of Halem and Shilpah. The extravagance of such figures is an old Puranic trick. It is often recited that a certain Purana or other work was of inconceivable length in the remote past, that Brahma or some great Rishi out of commiseration for the shortlived sons of man epitomised it. Even in a secular work like Sukranitisara, an excellent treatise

on the elements of polity, we are told that its original measure was of several crores of verses and that it was abridged into a few hundreds. I wish to guard myself against being understood that I admit that the original of the Bharata was really of the length of 24000 verses. It is no more than the estimate, of the compilers of the Bharata, of the extent of the portion of the present text really concerned with the subject-matter of the epic. Even in such portions there can be no doubt that the text must have been considerably amplified.

It is singular that there is no information in the present chapter or elsewhere as to when and how the text we now possess came to be reduced to writing. This information is badly wanted and has been suppressed.

All that we are told is that Vaisampayana recited the Bharata of one lakh of verses to Janamejaya. He did not read from a manuscript. We are not told precisely that Vyasa taught this text of one lakh to Vaisampayana. We are left to infer that he did from the statement that Vaisampayana was commissioned by Vyasa to recite it to the king. In the lines recording that Vyasa taught the text of 24000 verses to his son Suka and some among his pupils, Vaisampayana is not named nor the other pupils either. We must take it that he was included in that description. But that however was only the smaller text.

If the Sauti, who by the way was not a pupil of Vyasa, heard the recitation at the Court, apparently for the first and only time and forthwith set out on his travels, his only opportunity for knowing the text was

what he had obtained as one of the audience on that occasion. He does not say that he made a copy of it for his own use. On his return from his tour he goes to Saunaka's place and starts his recitation at once. He nowhere tells us that he got the poem by heart and yet he must have done so. For he was asked to repeat word for word Vaisampayana's narration and he pledged himself to do so. The reason of this is apparent. For, if we are to take it that the Sauti re-told the story in his own words, it would follow that the Bharata was the Sauti's own composition and not Vyasa's. How then did he manage to master the whole text of one lakh of verses, by *hearing* it recited only once? He must have had a wonderfully retentive memory. This is a large order on the credence of subsequent generations and a poor compliment to their good sense. For the Sauti at least was human, neither divine nor semi-divine. He was a wandering minstrel, seeking patronage and relating stories for lucre.

We are not told here or elsewhere that Vaisampayana's recitation or the Sauti's was committed to writing either contemporaneously or later. How, when and by whom was the existing text reduced to writing? How was it handed down? Was no room found amid the mass of the lakh of verses to supply this information?

#### CHAPTER IV.

Let us pass on.

We have next a tree-metaphor again, but this time the tree is not the Bharata, but Duryodhana with his



councillors for the branches. Yudhishtira is changed likewise into another tree.

And next, without any preamble, the chapter proceeds to give a synopsis of the events of the Bharata. This portion, which is rather long, appears to have been compounded of extracts from several pre-existing originals. The style or manner is not uniform and there is evidence of considerable manipulation. The first part of it, in which I include verses 110 to 118 (Cal. edition), must have belonged to an early date. Verses 110 to 115 furnish a singular instance in Sanskrit composition of Anacoluthon. The passage betrays a very crude attempt at composition. The matter of the verses from 110 to 119 shows that they could have been penned only at an early period, long before the story was reconstructed on more approved lines.

I shall now set out these verses below :—

पाण्डुर्जित्वा बहून् देशान् बुद्ध्या विक्रमणेन च ।	
अरण्ये मृगयाशीलो न्यवसन् मुनिभिस्सह ॥	११०
मृगव्यवायनिधनात् कृच्छ्राम् प्राप स आपदम् ।	
जन्मप्रभृति पार्थानाम् तत्राचारविधिक्रमः ॥	१११
मात्रो रभ्युपपत्तिश्च धर्मोपनिषदम् प्रति ।	
धर्मस्य वायो शक्रस्य देवयोश्च तथाश्विनोः ॥	११२
तापसैस्सह संवृद्धा मातृभ्याम् परिरक्षिताः ।	
मेध्यारण्येषु पुण्येषु महता माश्रमेषु च ॥	११३
ऋषिभिर्यत्तदा नीता धार्तराष्ट्रान् प्रति स्वयम् ।	
शिशवश्चाभिरूपाश्च जटिला ब्रह्मचारिणः ॥	११४

पुत्राश्च भ्रातरश्चेमे शिष्याश्च सुहृदश्च वः ।	
पाण्डवा एत इत्युक्त्वा मुनयोऽन्तर्हितास्ततः ॥ ॥	११५
तांस्तैर्निवेदितान् दृष्ट्वा पाण्डवान् कौरवास्तदा ।	
शिष्टांश्चवर्णाः पौराये ते हर्षाच्चुकुशुर्भृशम् ॥	११६
आहुः केचिन्नतस्यैते तस्यैत इति चापरे ।	
यदाचिरमृतः पाण्डुः कथम् तस्येति चापरे ॥	११७
स्वागतम् सर्वथा दिष्ट्वा पाण्डोः पश्याम सन्तातिम् ।	
उच्यताम् स्वागतमिति वाचोऽश्रूयन्त सर्वशः ॥	११८

110. "By His prudence and courage, Pandu having conquered many countries, dwelt in the forest among the Rishis and was addicted to the chase.

111. "By the death of the deer engaged in coition he (Pandur) met with extreme calamity. The conduct and observances of the Pandavas from their birth.

112. "Their birth from their mothers in accordance with the precepts of the law, as the sons of Dharma, Vayu, Indra and the Ashwins.

113. "They grew up with the holy men, under the tutelage of their mothers, in the sacred groves of the forest and the hermitages of the great.

114. "Then that they were taken themselves to the Dhartarashtras. 'Infants, comely, with matted hair, practising Brahmacharya;

115. These are your sons, brothers, pupils and friends. These of Pandu'. Having said this, the holy men disappeared.

116. "The Kauravas, the elders of the castes and the citizens, seeing the Pandavas thus introduced cried out for very joy.

117. "Some said, "these are not his." (Pandu's sons.) Others said "these are his". Yet others said, "seeing that Pandu died so long ago, how can these be his"?

118. "Welcome anyhow, by good luck we see the issue of Pandu before us. Let us say 'Welcome;' such words resounded on every side."

Let us review the verses.

119. The summary starts with Pandu's trip to the hills from his love of the chase. He then took up his residence there for good. We are not told that this was due to the curse of a Rishi or whether it was due to anything more than his love of sport.

III. The next verse is important. There is a variation of reading in the first phrase of the first line requiring to be noticed. The Madras and Dravida texts read मृगव्यायाम. In the Calcutta edition we find मृगव्यवाय. I incline to think that the southern reading should be preferred here. It means that Pandu was killed (by accident) in the chase. The other reading मृगव्यवाय would land us in some difficulty. It might mean that Pandu met with his death while engaged in the act of coition with a doe. (Probably having been shot by a forester, under the idea that he was shooting at a deer). This would be the only natural rendering grammatically. In this rendering व्यवाय would be of the instrumental or locative case. We might construe the phrase व्यवायनिधन also as a possessive compound. It

would then mean 'by the death of the copulation of the deer'. That would not make sense. To bring it into accord with the story as it now stands in the text, we must deduce from the phrase the meaning:—"By the death of the deer engaged in the sexual act." But to be able to do this we must make yet another change. 'By the death' must be changed into 'by the slaughter or slaying.' This change would be equally unwarranted; निधन in Sanskrit means death, the extinction of life, suffered. It does not mean killing. To make this note intelligible, I have to state a few words in advance about Pandu's adventure in the woods, and his life in the forest. He had the folly to shoot a buck engaged with his doe. It turned out however that the buck and the doe were an austere Rishi and his chaste lady who were taking their pleasure in that metamorphosis. The Rishi-buck in human accents, a little before his death, pronounced a curse on Pandu to the effect that the latter should perish in the act of sexual intercourse. From that time forward, the world offered no charms of life for Pandu. In a spirit of asceticism he made up his mind to spend the rest of his days in the forest and to observe celibacy. Sometime later, the religious necessity of obtaining sons was brought home to his mind. But it was not possible for him to get children in the ordinary way, by reason of the Rishi's curse. He therefore prevailed on his two wives to beget children for him (by the good offices of the gods). They did so and the Pandavas were born in due course. Some years later, Pandu lost his self-control in the first bloom of spring. He was out in the glades in company with his younger wife. She had not the good sense to resist. He embraced her and

breathed his last. He was duly cremated by the Rishis of the hermitage. Madri, the partner in that mortal offence, committed sati on the funeral pyre of the husband. The humane Rishis at once took the surviving wife and the Pandavas to their uncle at the capital, which they reached on the 17th day of Pandu's death. The Pandavas then had a triumphal entry and a most enthusiastic reception. They were at once acknowledged and assigned their proper places. This is the outline of the story as we now possess it in the text, in its proper place.

\* The story about the buck and the doe, and the repetition of the mishap in the case of Pandu is an astronomical fable which will be unfolded later on. In the earliest version it is probable that the story went that Pandu was killed by accident in the chase, a short time after he had entered the forest. This did not suit the inclinations of the revisers, who reconstructed the story on new lines. And to bring this preliminary verse into accord with the story as developed, it is conceivable that the word व्ययाम should have been altered into व्यवाय, as the nearest approach to the change desired, the grammar and logic being left to take care of themselves; or it may be that, in the first stage of the variation, preparatory to further development, Pandu was made the active agent in the love affair with the doe: मृगव्यवायनिधनात् is not by its natural significance capable of being brought into conformity with the existing story. It suggests that Pandu was himself engaged with the doe. The idea need not be wondered at. It is frequently met with in the Puranas.

Sringi, the youthful Rishi in the Bharata, who pronounced the curse on Parikshit which came to pass and brought about the death of the latter, was the issue of a doe by a great Rishi.

Rishya Sringa, with whose help Dasaratha of the Ramayana got his children, was so born. The fable is often paraphrased in a less objectionable way. A Rishi is disturbed by the presence or intrusion of a fair nymph while bathing in the river. He drops his 'seed' into the water. A hind or doe drinks the water and conceives and, after the period of gestation is over, brings forth a very presentable human Rishi. I incline to think that the correct reading is मृगव्ययामनिधनात्, meaning that Pandu was accidentally killed in the chase. The extreme calamity which he suffered was his own extinction. He paid the debt of nature. The probability of this suggestion is enhanced by what will appear as we proceed.

The other verses set out above betray a run of the narrative entirely at variance with what we now have.

The birth of the children is mentioned only after the death of Pandu is recorded. It also appears

(1) That the children were not begotten during the life-time of Pandu.

(2) That the widows survived Pandu and, later, got the children by means allowed by the usages of the time and brought them up with the help of the charitable Rishis.

\* See appendix No. I (1).

(3) That the widows and the orphans were kindly looked after and taken care of by the holy men.

(4) That the Pandavas spent a considerable time in the hermitages, before it was thought proper to present them at Court.

(5) That when they were so presented, general opinion was divided as to their legitimacy i. e. propriety of affiliation to Pandu.

(6) That Pandu had died several years before they were presented at the capital.

(7) That many at Court were of opinion that these children were too young to have been born during the life-time of Pandu or in other words that the period that had elapsed from the death of Pandu was considerably longer than the period covered by the age of even the eldest boy.

Let us reflect a while on the last item of information given above. The question raised by some of the citizens was justified only in case Pandu had died several years before—a pretty long time. This was chronologically possible only in case we posit the death of Pandu not long after he went into the forest, and this is just the idea sought to be conveyed by the statement about *मृगव्यायामनिधनात्*, and the subsequent birth and growth of the Pandavas in the hermitages of the Rishis. It suggests that the Pandavas (plural) were all begotten subsequent to the death of Pandu; and at the same time, the assertion that the Pandavas were brought up among the Rishis under the care of their *mothers* is pregnant with meaning. If they started immediately after Pandu's death, where was the time

for them to be brought up by and among the Rishis ? It gives the negation to the later development that Madri committed sati in the flames that consumed the remains of her husband. It is clear that the Pandavas did not know Pandu, that the widows and the orphans were deeply under obligations to the good-folks of the forest resorts. If Pandu had lived to see his children grow, no Hindu writer would have said that they were brought up by their mothers with the help of Rishis.

The idea that the citizens were found, after all, to welcome the boys as the sons of Pandu, despite their misgivings, need not cause any surprise; for, the practice of widows raising issue for the spiritual benefit of their departed husbands as also for the perpetuation of lineage was well-known to all; and they had an example of it in the birth of Pandu himself and Dhritarashtra and Vidura. The citizens were not prepared to concede that they were the sons of Pandu's creation, but there was no difficulty in their accepting the affiliation. It seems to me that that was the idea intended to be conveyed in the above verses. A distinction has to be kept in mind. Pandu may, according to the usages of the ancients, have authorised his wives, during his life-time, to raise issue for him. The issue would still be his. But the usages also allowed widows to raise issue not for themselves, not to satisfy their appetite, but for the spiritual welfare of the husband. Such issue would still be his. In the latter case however, they would require the previous authorisation of the dying husband or of the agnates and elders of the gens. So that unless this authority could be proved satisfactorily there would always be a

cloud over the title of the issue to succeed. Pandu died far away from his home and kindred. If he died suddenly in the chase, a previous authorization was beside the question. The authorization of the holy men, on account of the worshipful position they occupied as a spiritual hierarchy, might perhaps serve instead. But it would require to be proved. It was to vouch this that the Rishis made the solemn speech and asseveration at the presentation of the children at Court, and vanished on the instant. They did not care to stay longer to be cross-examined. The reference to the धर्मोपनिषद् or the precept of the law conveys no suggestion that the appeal to the law (the usages) was made by Pandu, whatever may have been the manner in which he met with his death.

It is clear that, years before the Pandavas were taken to the capital, the people knew of the death of Pandu, and the first time that they were told of his children was only when they saw them face to face. That was why they were slow to believe. But if the Pandavas started on their journey to the capital the day after Pandu's death, they should have been the earliest messengers of the news and the Royal family or the townsmen could not have known anything of the tidings until the Pandavas were announced. If the children had been begotten during the life—time of Pandu, by levirate or otherwise, the report should have reached the capital contemporaneously or at least with the report of the death. That these several considerations are in point and are justified may be seen from an attempt made by an interpolator to tamper with the text. He seems to have understood that the

text of the verses given above was susceptible of criticism on the lines suggested here. He found, at the same time, that the outline of the story disclosed by them varied, in vital points, from the existing narrative. He set himself to amend and improve this summary to bring it into a line with the story as remodelled and developed before his time. The interpolation occurs in two places in the Dravida text. These additional verses are not found in the other copies. In the Dravida text in which we find them, they are marked by the editors as of doubtful authority.

Between verses 112 and 113 given above, two verses have been supplied as below.

‘ततो धर्मोपनिषदम् भूत्वा भर्तुः प्रिया पृथा ।

धर्मानिलेद्रां स्ताभिस्साऽऽजुहाव सुतवाञ्छया ।

तदुत्तोपनिषन्माद्री चाश्विनावाजुहावच ।

जाताः पार्था स्तत स्सर्वे कुन्त्या माद्र्याश्च मन्त्रतः ॥’

‘And then the precept of the law. Kunti, wishing to please her husband, invoked the gods Dharma, Vayu and Indra, *by them*, with the desire for children. Madri having received the precept from her, invoked the Ashwins. And thus all the Pandavas were born to Kunti and Madri by the Mantra.’ ‘Kunti was desirous of pleasing her husband.’ This is to suggest that Pandu was alive when the precept of the law was put into operation and that it was done at his request. The word ‘them’ in ‘by them’ is without an antecedent. This is strange. The idea of the writer was to convey by the word ‘them’ Mantras to summon the gods to Kunti's bed.

The reference to the Mantra explicitly is to negative, if possible, the suggestion of carnal knowledge, and to ascribe the birth to the potency of the incantation. The second passage of three lines was slipped in between verses 113 and 114.

‘तेषु जातेषु सर्वेषु पाण्डवेषु महात्मसु ।

माद्र्यातु सह संगम्य ऋषिशापप्रभावतः ॥

मृतः पाण्डु महापुण्ये शतशुद्धे महागिरौ ।’

“After all the noble Pandava princes had been born, Pandu having one day embraced Madri died as fore-ordained by the curse of the Rishi.”

The purpose of these lines was to state, explicitly, the fact, of later development, that all the Pandava princes were born during the life-time of Pandu and to emphasise the story of the Rishi's curse.

The circumstance, that it was deemed necessary to supply this gloss in the text itself, makes it abundantly clear that the original verses conveyed the contrary of what was sought to be stated or insinuated in the extra verses. It is clear therefore that the original version of the story must have been rewritten, and, in the case of each incident the reason for the alteration can be seen on a little reflection. I have only to state how the narrative stands in the text in the proper place, to enable the reader to perceive and appreciate the alterations for himself :—

(1) The Pandavas were all begotten and born during the life-time of Pandu with the help of the Mantra employed at his special request.

(2) They were brought up by him until his death, which occurred much later, at least 13 years after the children of Madri were born.

(3) The widow, Madri, committed sati on the funeral pyre of her husband.

(4) The Pandavas were presented at Court on the 17th day of Pandu's death, the interval having been covered by the journey from the mountains to the capital.

(5) On their march to Hastinapuram they were attended by thousands of Rishis, who presented them to their royal cousins.

(6) There was not the least suggestion of a doubt or misgiving as to their legitimacy.

(7) They were received immediately with the greatest eclat, recognised as lawful heirs of Pandu and treated accordingly. I have to add that they made a triumphal entry into Hastinapuram. Bhishma and the princes of the Blood Royal and all the nobles went out to receive them. The detail of the programme of the entry and the procession seems to have been very much like what it is when the heir-apparent to the Emperor of India lands at Apollo Bunder and proceeds into the city of Bombay. Let us pass on.

## CHAPTER. VI

Verses 119 to 121 continue the description of the welcome offered to the Pandavas as a very uproarious one, in language which is somewhat overdone.

Verses—122 to 125:—

तेऽ धीत्य निस्वितान् वेदान् शास्त्राणि विविधानिच ।  
 न्यवसन् पाण्डवास्तत्र पूजिता अकुतोभयाः ॥  
 युधिष्ठिरस्य शौचेन प्रीतः प्रकृतयोऽभवन् ।  
 धृत्याच भीमसेनस्य विक्रमेणार्जुनस्य च ॥  
 गुरुश्रूषया कुन्त्याः यमयो विनयेनच ।  
 तुतोष लोक स्सकल स्तेषाम् वीर्यगुणेनच ॥  
 समवाये ततो राज्ञाम् कन्याम् भर्तृस्वयम्वराम् ।  
 प्राप्तवा नर्जुनः कृष्णाम् कृत्वा कर्म सुदुष्करम् ॥

122 'They (the Pandavas) learnt all the Vedas and the several shastras and lived there universally respected, *having nothing to fear*.

123 'The citizens were pleased with the austere manner of Yudhisthira, with the courage of Bhimasena, and the valour of Arjuna.

124 'With the services rendered by Kunti to the elders and the humility of the Twins, as also by the heroic virtues of all.

125 'and then, at the great assemblage of Kings, suitors for the hand of Draupadi, Arjuna won her, having achieved a heroic deed."

We must bear in mind the statement in the first of these verses that the Pandavas lived at the capital unmolested and having had nothing to fear.

The next incident mentioned is the tournament at which Draupadi was won. This sequence of events

leaves untouched, a long chapter of the history of the Pandavas, as developed in the existing text.

It is necessary that I should set out briefly the events of the chapters left out in this summary above, to enable the reader to follow the discussion. The story as we now find it in its proper place in the text runs as follows:—

Soon after the Pandavas got settled at the capital, they were subjected to great persecution by Duryodhana and his wicked advisers. They excelled all others in the rapid acquisition of literary knowledge, in the games and sports appropriate to their rank, in the arts of warfare and in their filial duties.

The citizens and almost all at Court were greatly attached to them. They endeared themselves to one and all. Duryodhana had the sagacity to perceive, very early, that there was great danger of his being supplanted in the monarchy by his cousins. He made constant attempts on their lives, in particular on the life of Bhimasena, whom, on account of his Herculean strength, he feared very much. He had poisoned food served to Bhima. The latter digested it as easily as oat-meal-porridge. He had Bhima stung by serpents. This only redoubled his vigour. He had Bhimasena thrown into deep water, bound with fetters, when he was deep in slumbers. The fellow managed to snap his fetters and find his way to the lower regions, and after drinking seven potsful of the elixir of life, slept off his fatigue in seven days and came up to the land of the living on the eighth day. In the interval he was mourned for as dead. Duryodhana having

failed in his attempts to put the Pandavas out of the way, prevailed on his father to send them away to reside at Varanavata, a provincial town, which at some anterior period was a provincial capital. In view of this projected change of residence, Duryodhana had previously contrived the construction of a mansion for the Pandavas in the new place, entirely built of the most combustible materials such as naptha, lac, bitumen &c. Yudhisthira with his mother and brothers had to go. He was however fore-warned of the danger awaiting them by a kind friend. On his entry into the new place, he managed to excavate a subterranean passage by which they should escape in case of a fire breaking out. This came to pass. Before the year was out, the mansion was set on fire by Duryodhana's emissaries one day in the middle of the night. The Pandavas escaped through the secret passage. They had to cross the river at that late hour. Bhimasena swims across with all the rest clinging on to his person and struggling through the water. On reaching dry ground they are all so much fatigued that they sink from exhaustion. But it is necessary that they should go farther away to avoid the danger of being pursued. Duryodhana takes them all on his back and shoulders and makes his way into a virginal forest. There the way-worn, foot-sore and famished hero has an encounter with a huge demon of the name of Hidimba. He kills the demon in the fight and marries his sister. Meanwhile, the Pandavas are believed to have perished in the flames, on that fateful night. This information spreads to the capital. The blind old king displays considerable sorrow, real or pretended, and gives directions for their obsequies.

We left the Pandavas in the forest. Vyasa appears to them, voluntarily and speaks to them words of comfort and directs them to proceed to Ekachakrapuram and live there unknown for a twelve-month. Thither they all go and pass themselves for Brahmins and live by mendicancy. In the close vicinity of that town dwelt a demon, of the name of Bakasura, who was a cannibal. He had compounded with the townsmen for a tribute of one human being every day and a cart-load of food. This tribute was exacted day after day. The whole town was groaning under this misfortune. Yet there was no way out of it. One day it fell to the turn of the Brahmin, in whose house the Pandavas were sheltered, to make this supply. There was mourning and wailing in the house. The cause was explained. Out of gratitude for the Brahmin's hospitality, the Pandavas resolved that Bhimasena should go to the demon's lair and serve the breakfast to him. In the encounter that ensued the demon was killed by Bhima.

Soon after this event the Pandavas leave the place and being told that in the country of King Drupada the people were very generous and charitable to strangers and the poor, they take their way towards that district. On the road Vyasa appears to them and advises them to go to Drupada's capital, and gives them some fore-knowledge of the good fortune awaiting them there. They proceed apace. In the forest Arjuna has an encounter with the king of the Gandharvas. On reaching Drupada's capital, Arjuna takes part in the contest at the tournament and wins Draupadi as the prize. Duryodhana and his



friends are there. But they are not able to recognise the Pandavas until late in the day. When the prize is won Arjuna is mobbed and set upon by Duryodhana's party. Bhima goes to his help. A free fight takes place. Duryodhana and his men are routed and run away.

The reader will perceive that the train of these events, so full of pathetic interest, so full of thrilling incident and exciting adventure, forms a very important chapter in the history of the Pandus. It was not a thing to be skipped even in a summary. If three verses could be appropriated to the noisy welcome in the city, and five for the Rajasuya sacrifice performed by Yudhishthira, is it probable that the author of this summary should not have cared to make some reference to the chapters abridged above, some suggestion or allusion, however faint?

What could have been his design in omitting it? Why should he ignore it? A reference to the exodus to Varanavatam was certainly called for, and yet we do not find the least indication of a change of residence. The verses give us to understand that it was from Hastinapura, the capital, where they had all been together, that the Pandavas set out to try their fortune in the contest of skill at the capital of Drupada.

The inference is apparent that, when this summary of an earlier version, since admitted into this first chapter, was designed, the removal to Varanavatam and the subsequent adventures up to the point of Draupadi's espousals were unknown.

The statement in the first verse above (122), that the Pandavas lived at Hastinapura happily, without having anything to fear, is positively contradictory of the many episodes of persecutions to which they were subjected. The later developments about the malignity of Duryodhana may have been due to a desire on the part of the compilers to paint Duryodhana in the blackest colours and, by relativity, to enhance our estimation of the Pandavas and their heroism.

That there were no such persecutions at that period seems to derive corroboration from the sequel.

## CHAPTER VII

Next follow six verses which we may take together (126-131).

The first records that, from the day of his victory at Drupada's place, Arjuna was greatly feared by all, as the greatest warrior of the time.

In the next verse we are told that Arjuna made war on several kings and, by conquering them, enabled Yudhishthira to perform the sacrifice of Rajasuya. The third verse speaks of the hospitality and munificence at the sacrifice. The fourth informs us that Jarasandha and Sisupala were killed by Bhima and Krishna. The last two verses describe the presents laid at the feet of Yudhishthira, at the sacrifice; presents of precious stones, of gold, of cattle, of horses, of costly fabrics curiously wrought, of cotton, wool and silk.

Of the six verses given above the first is complimentary of Arjuna's prowess; the second speaks of his conquests abroad and introduces the Rajasuya. This summary is singularly and unaccountably defective when we compare it with the existing text. Between the nuptials of Draupadi and the Rajasuya there are very important episodes. Arjuna journeys out on an enforced pilgrimage of 13 months in the course of which he meets with many adventures and helps himself to several wives.

The most important adventure is that in which Subhadra, the sister of Krishna, elopes with Arjuna from Dwaraka, with the connivance of Krishna, a matter designed to cement the bonds of kinship and friendship between the Pandavas and Krishna.

Subsequent to this, Krishna and Arjuna set out on the 'humane' mission of blazing in conflagration the huge primeval forest of Khandava. This is traditionally regarded as a very great event and so portrayed. Before they undertook this task, to cure of a colic, Agni Arjuna and Krishna asked for divine arms and accoutrements. Agni promised to furnish them. He went to his friend Varuna (Poseidon) and besought his help. The latter accommodated and gave to Arjuna:—

1. A bow originally prepared by Brahma for the use of the God Soma, which would appear to have been left with Varuna; this was named Gandiva.

2. The ever-full quiver.

3. A chariot drawn by white horses and filled with weapons, offensive and defensive, to which was attached a pennant bearing the heraldic sign of a monkey with the lion's tail.

On the same occasion Krishna got his discus and the club. It was these arms and accoutrements that Arjuna used for the rest of his life and which, by reason of their divine essence, secured to him the victory in the great war. It is at the close of the Khandava incident that Arjuna fights Indra in a combat in which the latter comes out second best. Pleased with the valour of his son (Arjuna), Indra gives him some divine arms, Agneya, Varuna and Vayavyadi Astras.

Arjuna's marriage with Subhadra was certainly an event that should not have been omitted. It was of her that Abhimanyu, the lunar hero and the father of Parikshit, was born.

It is difficult to believe that anyone of the events set out above, the pilgrimage of Arjuna, or the marriage of Subhadra or the Khandava fire or the divine arms obtained from Agni and Indra, could have been left out with propriety.

They could all have been made to go into two or three lines.

Let us proceed.

132 to 135. Four verses.

In these verses we are told that the envy of Duryodhana was roused at the sight of the magnifi-

cence of the palace built by Maya for the Pandavas and of the Rajasuya sacrifice; that his choler was heightened when he was laughed at and ridiculed like a man in the street, when, walking up the corridor he tripped his foot and tumbled down. As the result, Duryodhana was found to suffer greatly in mind and body and had a pale, jaundiced appearance. This was reported to Dhritarashtra.

136 to 140.

अन्वजानात्तो द्यूतम् धृतराष्ट्रं सुतप्रियः ।  
तच्छ्रुत्वा वासुदेवस्य कोपः समभवन्महान् ॥ १३६  
नातिप्रीतमना आसीद्विवादांश्चान्वमोदत ।  
द्यूतादीननयान् घोरान् विविधांश्चाप्युपैक्षत ॥ १३७  
निरस्य विदुरम् भीष्मम् द्रोणम् शारद्वुतम् कृपम् ।  
विग्रहे तुमुले तस्मिन् दहतुं क्षत्रम् परस्परम् ॥ १३८  
जयन्तु पाण्डुपुत्रेषु श्रुत्वा सुमहदप्रियम् ।  
दुर्योधनमतम् ज्ञात्वा कर्णस्य शकुने स्तथा ॥ १३९  
धृतराष्ट्रश्चिरम् ध्यात्वा संजयम् वाक्यमब्रवीत् ।  
शृणु सञ्जय सर्वम् मे नचासूयितुमर्हसि ॥

“136. Dhritarashtra by reason of his fondness for his son gave permission for the game with dice. Krishna hearing of this was inflamed with anger.

“137. (Krishna or Dhritarashtra) was not much pleased, and encouraged disputes and winked at (or took no note of) the several barbarities like the game with dice *et cetera*.

“138. Not caring for (the good counsel of) Vidura, Krishna, Drona, Saradwata and Kripa, the Kshatriya race was involved in a conflagration of war.

139. While the Pandus were obtaining successes, hearing very unpleasant news, and understanding the mind of Duryodhana, Karna and Sakuni.

“140. Dhritarashtra reflected a long while and addressed Sanjaya in these words:— listen, Sanjaya to all I have got to say and do not think ill of me.”

The above passage in the original betrays a confused succession of indeterminate grammatical constructions.

The second line of the first verse, speaking of Krishna, must be taken, parenthetically. It is not clear to whom, as subject, the first line of the 2nd verse was meant to apply. Nor is it clear whether the whole of that line is to be read conjunctively of the same individual. The subject is wanting here as also for the next line. But the verse has been understood to refer to Dhritarashtra.

If Dhritarashtra was not much pleased, it was the more reason why he should not have encouraged disputes and, if the idea was that he did so encourage, some word of antithesis was required to keep up the sense. But it is conceivable that Krishna, not having been pleased with the issue of the game, should have set up quarrels in support of the Pandava cause.

The passage is certainly obscure. The third verse wants a subject, but the same is apparent. The suggestion, about the barbarities comprised in the *et cetera*

connected with the game, was probably intended to convey the idea of the attempt of Duryodhana to treat Draupadi as a slave-woman, (she was also lost in the bets) and to outrage her modesty in the open assembly.

The reader is requested to notice that, in the above summary, there is a sudden leap from the game with dice to the great war. This is very singular. The events of at least two books of the Bharata and of the most important chapter of the history of the Pandavas are here gone without a word of recognition. The two books are the Vana Parva and the Virata Parva, the third and the fourth books.

The Vana Parva is the second in length, in the whole Bharata as we now find, comprising more than eleven thousand verses. The Virata Parva numbers 3494 verses in the Dravida text.

In the existing text we find that the game of dice was *repeated* and, as the result of the wager, the Pandavas were condemned to a residence in forests for a period of twelve years and an incognito existence of town-life in the thirteenth year. If, in this last year, their identity was discovered it was agreed that they should be subjected to the same conditions for another period of twelve years and one, and so on.

The Vana-parva deals with their life in the forest for this period of twelve years, and the Virata with the incognito period of the thirteenth year.

We find in these books any quantity of romance and adventure, of moral episodes with sublime themes

and astronomical myths with a religious purpose, all welded into a harmonious whole with a considerable power of dramatic art.

It is here that we find the exciting battle between Arjuna and the God Siva, the heroic feats of Arjuna in his encounters with Rakṣhasas; his trip to the land of the gods, where he stayed for some years as the honoured and favoured guest of the Indra; the attempted rape of Draupadi by Jayadratha, a similar attempt in the incognito period on her virtue by Kichaka, and much other interesting matter. These two Parvas form some of the best reading of the Mahabharata. Space does not allow of dilating on the contents.

How was it possible that these two books should have been ignored entirely, except on the hypothesis that they were not known to the writer of this summary?

It is not clear whether the second game with dice was known to the writer of the summary. Referring to the context in its proper place in the existing text, we find the game repeated in the undermentioned circumstances.

At the first game owing to the loss of the bets Yudhishtira lost his kingdom, his wife and his wife. The result was the exclusive master of Pandavas with their wife

There was an uproar and gave back to the Pandavas

मन्युपरायणाः ॥

पुत्रप्रीत्या सहामि तत् ।

प्रीधन मचेतनम् ॥

पंडवस्य महौजसः ।

१४२

१४३

at play. It is conceivable that the Pandavas should have claimed back what they lost on the strength of Dhritarashtra's disclaimer, but that Duryodhana and his party were unyielding and held out, with the consequence that an appeal to arms was rendered inevitable. This however, is only a surmise. There is no knowing that this idea about Dhritarashtra's generosity existed in the first instance. It may have been that the quarrels started with accusations of foul play at the game, which doubtless would have been repudiated, and that the Pandus appealed to arms at the instigation of Krishna. It is significant from the statement about the Vivadas (disputations), whoever started them, that they supervened as the result of the game.

It is equally significant that Krishna was incensed when he heard of the gaming and that the disputations were started soon after and culminated in the war. This clearly betrays his hand in the matter. These surmises, calculated to account for the omission of the two books, may or may not be correct. But we are sure of our ground anyhow in concluding that the Vana Parva and the Virata are conspicuous by their absence from the summary; and there must have been some reason for the omission and a good one too.

next verse. 'जयत्सु पाण्डुपुत्रेषु &c.'  
'winning successes.' &c. This  
it relates to a point of  
ly been started and the  
s, sufficiently indicative  
issue: when Duryodhana

and his advisers were determined to continue the war and were not minded to make peace with their cousins. It is necessary to bear this in mind to judge whether the long series of verses following presently below and ending with the refrain तदानाशंसे विजयाय संजय is not an interpolation.

जयत्सु is a participial adjective in agreement with पाण्डुपुत्रेषु. The tense indicated by it is the progressive. That it is here used correctly there can be no doubt, as may be seen from the further fact that जयत्सु पाण्डुपुत्रेषु is an adverbial phrase qualifying 'श्रुत्वा', 'having heard'. The statement as to the ascertainment or understanding of the mind (intentions) of Duryodhana and his partisans makes it clear that they were certainly available for being spoken to and must have been interviewed before this alleged conversation between Dhritarashtra and Sanjaya was started.

Dhritarashtra continues speaking. We have to pass some verses cited below before we come to the तदानाशंसे Series.

श्रुतवानसि मेधावी बुद्धिमान् प्राज्ञसम्मतः ।

न विग्रहे मम मतिः नच प्रीये कुलक्षये ॥

१४१

न मे विशेषः पुत्रेषु स्वेषु पाण्डुसुतेषु वा ।

वृद्धम् मामभ्यसूयन्ति पुत्रा मन्युपरायणाः ॥

१४२

अहम् त्वचक्षुः कार्पण्यात् पुत्रप्रीत्या सहामि तत् ।

मुह्यन्तम् चानुमुह्यामि दुर्योधन मन्त्रेणम् ॥

१४३

राजसूये श्रियम् दृष्ट्वा पाण्डवस्य महौजसः ।

- तच्चावहसनम् प्राप्य सभारोहणदर्शने ॥ १४४
- अमर्षेण स्वयम् जेतुं मशक्तः पाण्डवान् रणे ।  
निरुत्साहश्च संप्राप्तुम् सुश्रियम् क्षत्रियोपिसन् ॥ १४५
- गान्धारराजसहितः छद्मयूत ममन्वयत् ।  
तत्र यद्यद्यथाज्ञातम् मया सञ्जय तच्छृणु ॥ १४६
- श्रुत्वा तु मम वाक्यानि बुद्धियुक्तानि तत्त्वतः ।  
ततो ज्ञास्यसि माम् सौते प्रज्ञाचक्षुष मित्युत ॥ १४७

141 "O Sanjaya, you are possessed of great intelligence, recognised by the wise. You have heard (I daresay), that I have no desire for war nor for the extinction of my tribe.

142 "I make no difference between my own sons and those of Pandu. These wrathful sons of mine hold me lightly because of my old age.

143 "I am blind and poor of spirit and suffer all they do from my fondness for my sons.

"I err with my erring and ignorant son Duryodhana.

144 "Unable to bear the sight of the magnificence of the Pandava at the Rajasuya sacrifice and subjected to derision on his way to the great hall, he, Duryodhana, had his envy and wrath provoked.

145 "Unable to overcome the Pandavas in battle and wanting in courage, though a Kshatriya, to win by arms true opulence,

146 "He planned with his uncle the crafty game

with dice. O Sanjaya, listen to what all I have learnt as to that, even as I have learnt the same.

147 "Hearing my well-reasoned words—in truth, you will then understand, Sanjaya, that I am able to see with my intellect." Next follows the तदानांशे series.

In the first instance, it is not clear why this long confession of Dhritarashtra is introduced here into this summary of contents. It is not wanted nor is it in consistency with any sense of proportion.

Verse 138 recorded the outbreak of the war. The summary should have proceeded to give some more information about the war and bring it to a close; or pass onwards if there was matter to be stated. The introduction of this dialogue between Dhritarashtra and Sanjaya, which should find its proper place in a future book, is certainly misplaced here. The reason is obvious. Dhritarashtra's unbosoming himself to Sanjaya is intended to serve as an introduction to the तदानांशे series. Neither this introduction nor the series following could ever have formed an integral part of the first chapter. They were excerpted from other versions and inserted here to suit the caprice of the compiler of the first chapter. He seems to have taken a fancy for the verses of the series. They give an excellent summary of the developed text, starting with the incident of the fire at Varanavatam to the close of the war of extermination.

An such summary and to make up for other shortcomings, the compiler seems to have wished to

find some excuse for bringing it in, and the preamble of Dhritarashtra's confession was either devised by the compiler or excerpted from somewhere.

Now let us look at these verses again. The first thing to be regarded is that Dhritarashtra uses the present tense speaking of his sons, their advisers and the Pandavas.

He says 'I *make* no difference between my sons and those of Pandu.'

'My sons *hold* me lightly.' अभ्यसूयन्ति. 'I *suffer* all that from my fondness for them.' सहामि.

'I *err* with the erring Duryodhana.' अनुमुह्यामि.

There can be no doubt therefore that, at the time of this alleged conversation of Dhritarashtra with Sanjaya, his sons were all well. Take this with the text foregone, and already explained जयत्सुपाण्डुपुत्रेषु, the matter may be regarded as conclusively shown. That being so, the reader will feel surprised to find in the तदानाशंसे series, that, at the time of Dhritarashtra's speaking, Duryodhana and all his brothers and all the warriors on his side and of the party of the Pandavas had been killed in the war. Only seven on the side of the Pandavas and three of the faction of Duryodhana survived. This makes it clear that the passage of तदानाशंसे verses could not have originally formed a part of this chapter or intended as a continuation of the text जयत्सुपाण्डुपुत्रेषु. It was introduced as a happy summary, without '*mutatis mutandis*' and in

discordance with the preceding verses, which must originally have been completed on other lines.

The next point to be noticed is that, in these verses, (vide 144, 145, and 146) we are told that the envy of Duryodhana was roused by the magnificence of the Rajasuya and its appointments; that he grew worse in temper after the ridicule to which he was subjected at the palace; that thereupon he conceived the idea of achieving, indirectly, by means of the game with dice, what he could not obtain, directly, by trying the issues of war.

This is just what we were told once before in verses 132 to 135.

It is clear therefore that the origin of the trouble was at the Rajasuya. The idea of the existence of any bad feeling on the part of Duryodhana before that does not appear and is negatived by the suggestions contained in these verses (132 to 145 and 144 to 146).

Let us read with this fact the other one that, in the earlier portion of this summary, after verse 124, the next recital is that of Draupadi's marriage, and not of the persecutions to which the Pandavas were subjected by Duryodhana, or of the exodus to Varanavatam and the conflagration of the house of lac—incidents, all of which, if known, should have found mention immediately after verse 124 and next before the mention of Draupadi's swayamvaram.

Let us also take note of the statement in verse 122 that the Pandavas lived at the capital, without any trouble, and having nothing to fear.

It seems to me that the inference is irresistible that, at an early period of the Bharata, the incidents omitted in the text of this chapter without mention, about the early persecution of the Pandavas and the consequential episodes were unknown and that they were developed later.

I have to advert to another fact in connection with the verses cited above. In verse 146 Dhritarashtra is made to say :—"O Sanjaya, listen to what all I have learnt *as to that*."

This phrase '*as to that*' can have reference, with ordinary grammatical propriety, only to the game with dice, referred to in the previous verse. Or by a stretch, it may be made perhaps to relate back also to the Rajasuya incidents. That I reckon is the farthest point to which the relation can be carried back. It stands to reason, therefore, to expect further speech of Dhritarashtra to dwell on these incidents, perhaps to give some detail or make some disclosures, *apropos*. There was no occasion for Dhritarashtra to start a resume of the events from the earlier chapters of the history to the close of the war. But what follows is really not consonant with the idea.

## CHAPTER. VIII

We are now sufficiently equipped to study the तदनाशंशे series.

The refrain means, "O Sanjaya, I then despaired of success."

The verses so wound up number 65 in the Calcutta and Madras editions, 68 in the Bombay and 69 in the Dravida text. They all begin with the phrase यदाश्रौषम् and end with the refrain तदनाशंशे विजयाय सञ्जय. At the end of this long passage we have four more verses. The first three of these are done in the same metre, as the तदनाशंशे series, an imitation of Vedic metre. The last is in Anushtubh, the standard metre of the Bharata.

The Dravida edition includes three verses not found in the Calcutta or Madras copies. The 65th verse of the Calcutta edition is enlarged into two in the Dravida text, the four extra verses of which are thus accounted for.

The arrangement of the sequence of some of the initial verses betrays an error which must have passed unnoticed for ages.

The first verse speaks of Draupadi's swayamvaram. The second of the next event of Subhadra's elopement. The third refers to the Khandava forest and the battle with Indra. This incident of the battle with Indra closes the आदिपर्व or the first Book. It is therefore surprising to find the fourth verse taking us back to the period of time prior to that indicated by the first verse. The reference in the fourth verse is to the act of arson in Varanavatam, long before the espousals of Draupadi. The next verse, the fifth, is a repetition of the event of Draupadi's swayamvaram, though in chronological sequence it comes correctly after the incident at Varanavata. The other verses of the series keep up the record in order of time. The



fourth and fifth verses ought to stand at the head of the series. The error in the arrangement may have been due to a corrupt manuscript copied by the compiler of this chapter. In the present order, however, we find the verses fixed in all the existing editions.

The repetition of Draupadi's swayamvaram is a singular exception in the series and cannot be explained. An idea of the contents of this series can be gathered from the first verse and the closing ones.

I shall set out the first verse.

यदाश्रौषम् धनुरायम्य चित्रम्

विद्धम् लक्ष्यम् पातितम् वै पृथिव्याम् ।

कृष्णाम् हृताम् प्रेक्षताम् सर्वराज्ञाम्

तदा नांशसे विजयाय संजय ॥

'When I heard that the bow was strung and the mark being pierced was felled to the earth; that Draupadi was taken away (as the prize), while the assemblage of (vaunting) princes looked on, then O Sanjaya, I despaired of success.' The allusion is to the incident, narrated in its proper place in the text, of the triumph of Arjuna at the swayamvaram of Draupadi, where she was won as the prize, in a successful contest of skill in archery.

I shall proceed to record the closing verses.

शोच्या गांधारी पुत्रपौत्रैर्विहीना

तथा बंधुभिः पितृभिर्भ्रातृभिश्च ।

कृतम् कार्यम् दुष्करम् पाण्डवेयैः

प्राप्तम् राज्यमसपन्नम् पुनस्तैः ॥

कष्टम् युद्धे दश शेषाः श्रुता मे त्रयोस्साकं पाण्डवानाम् च सप्त ।

ब्यूनाविंशति राहताक्षौहिणीनाम् तस्मिन् संग्रामे भैरवे क्षत्रियाणाम् ॥

'Gandhari is sorely to be commiserated, having been deprived of all her sons and grandsons, of her bandhus, parents and brothers. The Pandavas have indeed achieved a mighty task. They have recovered the kingdom having exterminated their enemies.'

"Oh, the pity of it! Sanjaya, ten and only ten persons have been left alive. Three of our side and seven of the party of the Pandavas. As many as eighteen Akshauhinis (army corps) have been annihilated in that frightful war (of extermination) of the Kshatriyas." Starting as above with the swayamvaram of Draupadi or, more correctly, with the earlier incidents at Varanavatam, the series records step by step the events of the epic, to the close of the internecine war, in which almost the whole tribe was exterminated, and the blind old man was left with his wife to bemoan the loss of their hundred sons and grandsons.

This is surprisingly out of gear with what appears above that, at the time of this alleged conversation between Dhritarashtra and Sanjaya, Duryodhana and his chief advisers were certainly alive and carrying on the war which had been just started.

This makes it certain that this series of verses did not originally form a portion of the first chapter, but that it was removed from its proper context and fitted into this chapter.

There is one more consideration adding to this proof.

In the supposed reply of Sanjaya to this *jeremiad* of Dhritarashtra, also imported into this chapter, we find as usual amid contradictory matter an important verse which clinches the point. In the course of a long sermon on the instability of things *mundane*, on the predetermined course of destiny, on the helplessness of man against fate, and the just retribution overtaking his sons, Sanjaya says to Dhritarashtra नृत्यन्तमेवानुवृत्तिः कार्यो ते पुत्ररक्षणे 'You need not exercise your mind too much to save or protect your sons.'

If indeed the sons had been killed in battle and their bones were bleaching on the field of Kurukshetra, this text is meaningless and little short of nonsense.

There was no son to be saved. The matter of these verses of the series indicates that they must have found their place originally in the closing chapters of the epic, in the eleventh Book named Striparva, appropriated to a description of the lamentations of the widowed women and the survivors.

The poet of *some version* of the Bharata, as he was coming to the close of the epic, would appear to have conceived, at that part of the poem, the idea of taking a retrospect of the events narrated in the text and wrote the तदानाशंसे series. The same must undoubtedly have been added to from time to time and the final step of tampering with it was to *detach* it from its proper context and to introduce it into the first chapter:—in doing which some bad handling could either not have been avoided or was not much cared for, reckoning that it might pass unnoticed; or perhaps the incongruity was not noticed. Agreeably to the

introduction with which these verses are let in, Dhritarashtra's narration should have come to a stop with the 10th verse of the series. Why was it continued farther? .

The synopsis of events given in this series accords fairly well with the existing text of the Bharata.

But there are some omissions which are suggestive. There is no allusion in this series to the adventures of Bhima after the escape of the Pandavas from the trap of the lac-house, such as his encounter with the Rakshasa Hidimba and the great event in Ekachakra-puram when Bhima succeeded in slaying the man-eating demon Baka. These incidents were of sufficient importance to have gone into the summary, conceived to hold up to admiration the heroic deeds of the Pandavas. They were probably not known even at the late period of the composition of this summary of the तदानाशंसे series. There is another fact to be noticed.

The summary of the तदानाशंसे series closes with the war. That is also the farthest position to which we are taken in the first chapter. For at the close of Sanjaya's reply the chapter winds up with benedictory verses.

The summary of the Sauti or the poet of the first chapter thus ends really with the incidents of what is now the Striparva or the eleventh Book. After the dismissal of Dhritarashtra and Sanjaya, who were brought in only for the purpose of this 'series', propriety required that it should be continued to the close of the text as we now find it. It is conceivable that Dhritarashtra's summary should have come to a close

with the passage of the series as found and excerpted. But, nothing could have stood in the way of the Sauti supplementing it and bringing it to a finish.

As the text stands we have seven more Books to close the Bharata. Why were they left unnoticed? Were they unknown at the time when the first chapter was compiled or were those seven Books regarded as apocryphal. But there was nothing apocryphal to the pious compilers of the Bharata. Some mention of these Books was called for from their tenor, for in them are comprised extensive dissertations on many topics of religion, morals, polity and philosophy, as also glimpses of life hereafter. We shall see when we proceed to study the next chapter, that there is a very valuable suggestion in it by way of inference, that Vyasa's Bharata was believed to have comprised only the first eleven Books of the text now extant. Putting these several facts together, that Dhritarashtra's summary ends with the contents of the eleventh Book; that the Sauti has not carried it farther; that his own summary, up to the point of his introducing Dhritarashtra, stops with the outbreak of the war, that the suggestion in the next chapter leads to the inference of only the first eleven Books being canonical; we may take it as tolerably certain that the last seven Books are spurious.

Another matter of some difficulty concerns the game with dice. It is referred to three times in this chapter. Once in the Sauti's summary in Verse 136, a second time in Dhritarashtra's preamble to the तदानाशंसे series in verse 146, and finally in the series itself, in Verse 157. In these several places, the text leaves something to be desired. These verses 136, 146 and

147 (Calcutta) do not give any indication of the incident known as Punardyutam or the repetition of the game with dice. They speak only of *a* dyutam. It is possible to argue that the second game must also be understood to have been comprised in the dyutam mentioned. But this, however does not appear to be probable. Let us consider the facts as we gather them from the existing text.

At the first game Yudhishtira lost his all, *kingdom* and everything; he lost himself, his brothers and their common wife. Dhritarashtra intervened and restored all that they lost to them. A second game was proposed by the wicked advisers of Duryodhana. But it was expressly stated that Yudhishtira's kingdom should not be wagered, this time, out of respect for Dhritarashtra's award.

The wager was accordingly varied:—"that the defeated party should go into banishment into the forests, where they should live for a period of 12 years and spend the thirteenth year 'incognito' in a populous town." This was the new article agreed on.

Yudhishtira was again worsted at play and went into exile to serve out the time.

This is the story as we find it in its proper place in the copies extant.

Let us examine the verses of the series relating to this chapter of incidents:—

यदाश्रैषम् द्रौपदी मधुकंठीम् सभाम् नीताम् दुःखितामेकवस्त्राम् ।  
रजस्वलाम् नाथवतीमनाथवत् तदानाशंसे विजयाय संजय ॥ १५५

यदाश्रैषम् वाससां तत्र राशिम् समाक्षिपत् कितवो मंदबुद्धिः ।  
 दुःशासनो गतवा नैवचांतं तदानाशंसे विजयाय संजय ॥ १५६  
 यदाश्रैषम् हृतराज्यम् युधिष्ठिरम् पराजितम् सौबलेनाक्षय्याम् ॥  
 अन्वागतम् भ्रातृभि रप्रमेयै स्तदानाशंसे विजयाय संजय ॥ १५७

155 'When I *heard* that the weeping Draupadi, without a change of raiment, ill after the way of women, was dragged into that public place, as if she were an unclaimed waif, then, O Sanjaya! I despaired of success'.

156 'When I heard that the wretch Dussasana (my son) started stripping her of her apparel in that public place and, though he raised a heap of her cloths, never succeeded in his iniquitous attempt, then, O Sanjaya! I despaired of success'.

157 'When I heard that Yudhishtira was deprived of his kingdom, having been defeated at the game with dice by Sakuni and that he was followed by his illustrious brothers, then, O Sanjaya! I despaired of success.'

The first verse refers to the incident when, by the loss of the bets, Draupadi having become a slave of Duryodhana, he asserted his rights over her person, by having her brought up by force into the gaming hall.

The second refers to the ill-advised attempt of Duryodhana's brother to outrage Draupadi's modesty, in that place, by stripping her of her apparel. She was, however, saved by a miracle, the result of which was that, as each time the cloth with which she

was habited was being removed, she stood fully draped as before.

After a huge heap of these cloths was thus formed, the reprobate Dussasana desisted in despair.

The third verse records the loss of his kingdom by Yudhishtira, as the result of the loss of the wager and his departure out. The events referred to in these three verses appertain to the first game with dice. It is impossible to deduce from them even a faint allusion to the defeasance of the result of the first game by the intervention of Dhritarashtra and a second game with varied wagers.

The kingdom was lost at the first game, but was restored. It was not the subject of the bets in the repeated game. The third verse therefore could have reference only to the first game.

There is another consideration which has a conspicuous bearing on this discussion. It should be borne in mind that the speaker is Dhritarashtra. It was he that restored the kingdom to Yudhishtira. It was to circumvent this act of the Patriarch that the second game was devised. Dhritarashtra undertook to make a frank disclosure of the events within his knowledge, to prove the injured innocence of the Pandavas and the wrongs inflicted on them by his sons. He refers to the incident of the lac-house and to the shameless attempts on the person of Draupadi. There was no motive for him to suppress the incidents connected with his own act of generosity, in restoring their all to the Pandavas, and the iniquitous and successful attempt of his sons to over-reach him by

the repetition of the game. As a fact of historical narration it was called for. It would certainly have given point to the *invective*. It was a circumstance that emphasised the wickedness of his sons and would have heightened the effect of the set-off. It was as much of a wrong to him as to the Pandavas. He had out of weakness suffered the first game. But the issue of it went farther than he had conceived or contemplated. He felt that he was an abettor if not a party to it. He atoned for his weakness and neglect, for his want of good sense and propriety, by nullifying by his fiat the results of that game.

The second game was not sanctioned by him. His permission was not sought for it. It was contrived to render nugatory the advantages obtained by the Pandavas through his intercession. Was it possible that he should have been reticent about this by-play?

The verses that follow record the exile of the Pandavas into the forest. But this cannot be held conclusive of the idea of the second game. There is no knowing that the episode of the Vanaparva was not the sequel of the first game, as the text stood at some period of its evolution.

I must advert to another omission in the series. The fight between Bhima and Kichaka, in the Virataparva, which ended in the death of the latter at the hands of the former, was an event which caused considerable sensation and strange forebodings to Duryodhana and his party. It was in the incognito period of the thirteenth year of the Pandava exile. Draupadi was serving out the period as the dressing maid of the queen of Virata. Bhima

was the king's cook, Kichaka was the brother of the queen. Kichaka conceived a strong but inglorious passion for Draupadi. His impudent attentions were resented. Draupadi appealed to the queen, who however did not care to interfere and perhaps even gave some encouragement to her brother. The attentions of the man became day after day more troublesome. In secret Draupadi complained to Bhima. A trap was contrived between them for Kichaka. Draupadi, under advice, made an appointment to meet Kichaka, in the middle of the night. Bhima went in unto him in woman's clothes. When they came to close quarters and the disguise was discovered a fight ensued and Bhima succeeded in slaying Kichaka, having reduced him to a shapeless mass.

Kichaka was a Simhabala or of the lion's strength. He was one of five contemporaries to whom that title was appropriated. Bhima and Duryodhana were two others; none but one of them could kill some other of them in a hand to hand fight. Great was the excitement therefore in Kaurava circles, when the news of Kichaka's murder spread. The suspicion of the Kauravas was aroused. They started inquiries. As yet they were unaware of the existence of the Pandavas at Virata's capital.

This episode should not have been suppressed.

That it was suppressed seems to have been a matter for comment on the part of orthodox scholars at some early period as is evident from an attempted interpolation. The third of the extra verses admitted into the Dravida text and marked as doubtful was directed to supply this missing item.

It is probable that the writer of the series, even in his own period, which must have been comparatively late, did not know of this incident. The episode of Kichaka's infatuation for Draupadi and his untimely end is the subject of a Greek fable, as I believe, adapted into the Bharata, in which it did not find a place in the first instance.

The verses of the series summarising the Vanaparva, the third Book, recapitulate some of the great deeds of Arjuna. Even some minor incidents of the life in exile are noted. But there is one notable omission, for which it is not easy to account. In the text as it now stands we have a very sensational episode of the rape of Draupadi by one Jayadratha, a powerful potentate. He found her alone one day at her place, used force to her, put her into his chariot and drove off at once. The Pandavas, a little later, came to know of it. They gave chase, overtook him, and after giving him a severe thrashing, spared his life and let him go at once.

The chapter is the record of a very exciting adventure. It is surprising that the series leaves out unnoticed both the attempts on the virtue of Draupadi narrated in the text.

The Vanaparva as now extant, contains several moral tales and upakhyānamas of which the series gives no indication. The scholar who wrote the extra verses found in the Dravida text, appears to have been impressed with this fact. He felt that some reference to these tales and episodes was needed, and accordingly supplied a verse, which says that the Pandavas had the good fortune in the period of their

exile to be interviewed by several Rishis of ancient renown and to acquire wisdom by their example and precept.

This was enough, for all these moral tales and episodes were narrated to Yudhishthira, by some one or other Rishi.

The third extra verse of the Dravida text makes up for a similar omission.

## CHAPTER IX.

The solace afforded by Sanjaya to the weeping blind king was of a very peculiar character. After enumerating a good number of princes, he winds up to this effect. "These princes, and thousands, nay millions like them, great in their generation and great in renown, have all passed away like your own sons, who, on the other hand, were vile reprobates and richly deserved the fate that overtook them. You should not mourn for the loss of such."

I have already dwelt on the sentence found in this speech, नात्यन्तमेवानुवृत्तिः कार्या ते पुत्ररक्षणे. With the close of Sanjaya's reply we come to the beginning of the end of the first chapter. From this point to the close of the chapter we have 23 verses in the Calcutta copy. These verses extol the great merits of the text and the spiritual benefits that one is promised by an attentive study or hearing of the text in general and of the first chapter in particular.

V. 250. and 251, the first two verses of the twenty-three, require some notice.

अत्रोपनिषदम् पुण्याम् कृष्णद्वैपायनो ऽ ब्रवीत् ।

विद्वद्भिः कथ्यते लोके पुराणे कविसत्तमैः ॥

भारताध्ययनम् पुण्यमपि पादमधीयतः ।

श्रद्धाधानस्य हीयन्ते सर्वपापान्यशेषतः ॥

The verses are not happily worded. But the meaning may be gathered.

250. 'Vyasa has spoken a holy precept here. The same is stated widely in the Purana by

251. Great and learned poets. (That) the study of the Bharata, even to the extent of a fourth of it, is productive of great religious merit; and all the sins of him who bestows attention (on the study) are expiated.'

I take it that the singular 'Purana' in the above is put for the plural.

But the question arises, what time had elapsed between the publication of the Bharata by Vaisampayana and the recital by the Sauti. It should certainly have been sufficiently long to admit of the growth of a reverential tradition in respect of it, justifying an exhortation as to its study by the learned authors of the Puranas, and an appeal to them for authority by the Sauti himself. But the interval, as we are told, was very short, just enough to cover the period of the Sauti's tour as a pilgrim, previous to his visit to Saunaka's place, where we now find him comfortably settled. It is impossible that in this short space Puranas should have come into vogue 'with the rapidity of the prophet's gourd.' What were the Puranas referred to? Where and when had the Sauti the opportunity for informing himself of their contents?

There can be no doubt that this preliminary chapter must have been prepared in a much later age than the Bharata itself.

This chapter is formally designated as अनुक्रमणिकाध्यायम् or 'the chapter setting out the sequence.' It is impossible to say whether this अनुक्रमणिका had any basis for it in the corresponding अनुक्रमणिकाध्याय of Vyasa which, we were told above (see p. 37), was completed in 150 verses. For, we find that the whole of the next chapter is really concerned with the अनुक्रमणिका and is designed as a summary of the contents of the poem.

We need entertain no doubts, therefore, of the original purpose of this chapter, or of the propriety of examining it on that footing.

We are also told that the Bharata is the best of Itihasas.

One verse of these 23 merits particular attention. It throws considerable light on the methods in use in the composition of the Puranas and Itihasas. It was probably copied from Vasishtha's Dharma Sastra.

इतिहासपुराणाभ्याम् वेदम् समुपबृंहयेत् ।

विभेद्यल्पश्रुताद्वेदो मामयम् प्रहरिष्यति ॥

The verse is a direction to future authors of Puranas. It reads thus:—

'Itihasas and Puranas ought to be replete with Vedic lore. For the Veda is sorely afeared that one with only a little knowledge of it would strike it, (or

hinder its progress). 'Drink deep or taste not the Pierian spring.'

The purport of the passage seems to be to this effect:—"It is certainly to be wished that the Vedas should be studied. But study them in full if you can. If you cannot it is better that you should not be a smatterer. Let the Puranas be so ordered as to include, in one way or other, all Vedic-teaching so that those who are not inclined to study the Vedas, at first hand, might turn to the Puranas to acquire the same knowledge, secondarily."

This is a furtive suggestion to throw the Vedas overboard, and an attempt to exalt the Puranas above the Vedas.

The idea will be found developed in two verses which we read towards the close of this chapter.

एकतुष्टुवेदान् भारतम् चैतदेकतः ।  
पुरा किल सुरैस्सर्वैस्समेत्य तुल्या धृतम् ॥  
चतुर्भ्यस्सरहस्येभ्यो वेदेभ्यो ह्यधिकम् यदा ।  
तदा प्रभृति लोकेस्मिन् महाभारत मुच्यते ॥

This above is from the Sauti.

'The Gods all came together *of old*, and weighed the Bharata in the balance against the four Vedas. As the Bharata outweighed the four Vedas and all the secrets they contained, from that time forward, it has been known *in this world* as the Mahabharatam.'

One may be pardoned for asking 'from what time was the work so known? When was it that the gods took the weight and found the Vedas wanting?'

The word पुरा is very important. It is an Avyaya or 'Indeclinable.' It is used ordinarily to indicate the remote past, as in historical narration. It is at least the past indefinite. It is never the present perfect. The nearest approach to it in sense, in the English language would be 'once upon a time.'

Whatever the exact interval between this act of the gods and the Sauti's recital was, it must have been considerable, as in the case of ages ago, to justify the use of the word पुरा; and yet, the Sauti had only just returned after he had left the capital, with the last accents of Vaisamapayana still ringing in his ears.

What time intervened between the completion of the Bharata and its weighing by the gods, we cannot tell.

The Sauti knew of the result and so did much of the world of his time and before his time, for the work had already acquired, in the *world* of the living, the appellation of Mahabharata. This is passing strange. We are not told how the mortals came to know of this verdict of the gods.

Was the weighing done on the earth or in the land of the gods!

We are not as yet fairly out of the difficulty. Which was the text of the Bharata that the gods put on the scale-pan? Was it the text of 24000 verses, or the existing one, supposed to be of one lakh of verses, or the text of 30 lakhs, assigned to the gods themselves? As the test applied was a physical one, with the result appreciable in a notation of pounds avoirdupois, it is probable that the text weighed was that of the 30 lakhs,



for it is conceivable that that text should have outweighed all the Vedas put together. The four Vedas bulk largely and ponderously. It is not probable that even the text of one lakh should have outweighed them.

But as the name Mahabharata is known to us here in association with the existing text and as we are told that the title came into vogue in *this* world, we must infer that this was the text of which the weight was taken. But why should the gods have singled out this text in particular. The Vedas are eternal. They were the first utterance of the Creator. They were intended both for gods and men. This text of Vaisampayana, whether of 24000 verses or one lakh, was intended only for men. It was the work of a man, however great his eminence was. The gods had a version of 30 lakhs entire for themselves. It stands to reason to suppose that, if the gods were minded to submit the Vedas to the indignity of a test like that, they would probably have chosen the text assigned to them, for weighing against the Vedas. Why should they have ignored their own text of 30 lakhs, or the text made over to the Pitris of 15 or that of the Daemones of 14 lakhs?

The probability is that this text of ours started as the Bharata, and after the interpolators succeeded in elaborating it, it came to be styled, under their auspices, as the Mahabharata or the great Bharata.

We are told, finally :—

महत्वा द्वावत्वाच्च महाभारतमुच्यते ।

निरुक्तमस्य यो वेदः सर्वपापैः प्रमुच्यते ॥

“On account of its greatness and its weight it is called the Mahabharata; and whoever understands the derivation of this word (as given here) is redeemed from all sins.”

It is not generally known, however, that salvation, if it is worth having, could also be had so easily.

The first chapter closes with a moral, bad in its logic and of doubtful propriety.

## CHAPTER X.

I have to introduce to the reader, here, a metrical translation of the Mahabharata into the vernacular dialect of Telugu. The translation was started by a great Telugu poet of the name of Nannaya Bhatta. He was a Brahmin, a great scholar and accomplished poet. He flourished at the Court of the Eastern Chalukya king, Vishnuvardhana, who had his capital at Rajahmundry, on the northern bank of the Godavery in the East—Coast district of the same name and is believed to have ruled from 1022 to 1066 A.D.

The poet completed the rendering of the first two Books and passed away after a considerable portion of the third Book had been done. The work was completed after long intervals of time by two other poets of great eminence. These three poets deservedly rank as the greatest in the field of Telugu Literature. The work of the first of them, comprising the first two Books and the unfinished portion of the third, was written, as ascertainable from historical records, towards the earlier part of the 11th century of the Christian era. It is thus at least 900 years old. Its value, therefore, for

comparative criticism, is very great. At that period it appears that the text of the Bharata had already been consolidated almost entirely into its present form. While therefore, indentity of matter conveys no indication as to the antecedent period at which an interpolation may have found its way into the text, the existence of any significant variation or omission is full of suggestion.

The translators undertook the task as a religious one. They were all Brahmins, eminent as men of letters even in times so prolific of true scholarship. They allowed themselves a certain latitude, which would bear comparison with the similar work of translators elsewhere. They might abridge a tedious narrative, they might ignore tiresome repetition. In places where the description of a landscape or seasonal scenery, or the personal charms of a beautiful woman or other like topic formed the theme, they might give free play to their fancy and develop the sketch in a style of art favoured by them. But there are matters with which they could not and did not tamper. They could not alter the facts or the sequence of historical narration. They might correct an apparent error or accidental slip. They might set right an incorrect reading. They might leave out an unimportant portion, but if they chose to embody it they could not mistranslate it. They could not misplace geographical locations or unsettle chronological data, or vary arithmetical figures. They might perhaps occasionally take liberties in the arrangement of the matter, where the context allowed and where the narrative would not suffer but, on the other hand, gain by the dislocation. But they could not, as Brahmin poets, suppress passages which were put into the original text, with a set purpose that every Brahmin could

easily understand, and to suppress which would be little short of profanation.

They were orthodox scholars, who believed in the religious merit of a study of the Bharata. They say so in their work. They expected to achieve a higher merit by rendering the text accessible to the general.

This is what heightens the value of this translation for purposes of comparative study. The first portion of the Telugu translations was done at the Court of a powerful monarch to whom it was dedicated. His vanity or that of his ancestors suggested the derivation of his lineage from the Pandavas themselves. It is not possible or probable that incorrect renderings should have been offered to or passed unchallenged by the assembly of literary talent at his Court.

It is a matter for wonderment that the Telugu Bharata does not speak of the visit of Brahma to Vyasa or of the copy prepared by Ganesa to the dictation of Vyasa.

Was it possible that the Brahmin translator of the Bharata should have suppressed these incidents if they existed in the text that he followed? What motive could he have had for suppressing them? They were calculated to heighten the sanctity of the original work; and would certainly have tended to enhance the scriptural value of the translation and the religious merit of the translator. Was it for him to suppress the fact that the great Bharata was ushered into existence by the pen of Ganesa under the sponsorship of the Creator of the universe? Telugu poets are generally in the habit of inventing such embellishments; and this poet could certainly not have served either himself or his reader by

suppressing these recitals. At any rate, this suppression was not calculated to flatter the vanity of the monarch to whom the work was dedicated. On the other hand, we find in the Telugu Bharata, language, in profusion, reproducing the praises bestowed on the work of Vyasa in the original and expressing, in glowing language, the benefits, religious and secular, supposed to flow from a study or knowledge of its contents.

There is another fact requiring mention. The Telugu Bharata is clear that it was the identical text recited by Vaisampayana to Janamejaya that was recited also to the gods, the pitris and the Daemones

Narada, Suka &c. It is apparent that the Sanskrit text of the Telugu poet, contained, in this respect, something different from what we now possess.

Further comment is superfluous.

We are now in a position to take a survey of the main results of this discussion.

- I 1. The first Chapter, as we now find it, formed no part of the original Bharata.
2. It was composed at a late stage and itself was repeatedly handled for revision by interpolators.
3. At what period the first chapter was started in its original form, does not appear; nor the period when it was settled in the present form. We cannot state how much of the existing Bharata had been redacted when the text of the first chapter was settled as we now find it.
4. It is probable that the first chapter was worked up into form by the piecing together of extracts from a variety of pre-existing versions of the

Bharata, with the contribution of some new matter.

II (a) The verses noted hereunder are out of context.

The verses :—

1. तस्यवृक्षस्य वक्ष्यामि शाखाषुष्पफलोदयम् ।
2. मन्वादि भारतम् केचि दास्तीकादि तथापरे ।

The verse :—

3. सर्वेषाम् कविमुख्यानामुपजीव्यो भविष्यति ।  
पर्जन्य इव भूतानाम् अक्षयो भारतद्रुमः ॥

Ought to be at the head of the passage in which the tree-metaphor is developed and verse 1. should be put above it.

(b) The disorder of the initial verses of the तदानाशंसे series and the repetition in them of Draupadi's swayamvaram have to be noted.

III (a) The verses 136 to 138 probably formed part of the composition of the writer of the verses, 110 to 118, as betrayed by their awkward structure.

(b) The Dravida text repeats a verse and a hemistich without warranty, betraying some bad handling.

तपसा ब्रह्मचर्येण व्यस्य वेदम् सनातनम् ।

इतिहास मिमम् चक्रे व्यास स्मृत्यवतीमुतः ॥

अनुक्रमणिकाध्यायम् वृत्तान्तम् सर्वपर्वणाम् ॥

This hemistich is quite out of context where it occurs for the second time.

IV The undermentioned are probably interpolations into the text of the first chapter.

1. The matter about the first creation.
2. The matter of the interview between Brahma and Vyasa.
3. The dictation to the short-hand of Gānesa.
4. The Sauti's description of the Bharata as including all the Vedas and Sastras.
5. The description of the Bharata by the developed tree-metaphor.
6. The reference to the 8,800 verses, the 24,000, the lakh, and the 60 lakhs of verses.
7. The dialogue between Dhritarashtra and Sanjaya.
8. The verses at the close about the great sanctity of the Bharata and the religious merit of its study, inclusive of the recital about the weighing of the Bharata in the balance against the Vedas.

V The undermentioned suggestions may be inferred from the contents of the first chapter:

1. That the Bharata existed in varying forms in varying periods.
2. That the extent at first of the Bharata of Vyasa, understanding by that phrase the original cast of the Bharata, was probably not greater than 8,800 verses.
3. That the upakhyānam formed no part of Vyasa's Bharata.
4. That the Bharata of Vyasa terminated with the main incidents of what is now the Striparva or the eleventh Book.

5. That the original work, in whatever shape it stood, came into existence at a period not so remote as that claimed for it.
6. That systematised efforts were made to convert it into an encyclopaedia.
7. That the didactic portions and those concerned with the elaboration of 'Vedic and Shāstraic' teachings were interpolations of later periods.
8. That the attempts of Duryodhana in the period of adolescence to oppress the Pandavas and to rid himself of them; the incident of the lac-house, the expatriation of the Pandavas; their subsequent mendicancy and the slaying of Baka, as also of Kimmira and other adventures of that period up to the espousals of Draupadi were unknown to the original text.
9. That, in the original conception of the story, the two wives of Pandu survived him and Madri did not commit Sati with his corpse.
10. That the Pandavas were born not during the life-time of Pandu, but sometime after his death and that they were brought up by their mothers with the help of the Rishis.
11. That when they were presented at Court it was in a humble way and their claim of affiliation to Pandu was doubted or denied.
12. That the Vanaparva and the Virataparva were probably unknown at some period. (The probability is greater in the case of the latter).

13. That the restoration of the Kingdom to Yudhishthira after the game and the repetition of the game were later developments.
14. That the envy of Duryodhana was roused by the splendour of the Rajasuya, and that, if it existed before, it was only in a state of subconsciousness, but did not lead to any overt act on his part.
15. That the commencement of the real Bharata is probably to be looked for only with the account of Uparicharavasu.
16. That the commencing chapter of the Bharata varied at different periods according to the admission into the text of interpolations.
17. That at some period, the Mahaprasthanika and Swargarohana parvas (the last two) had either no existence at all or no independent existence.
18. That the Bharata affords ample evidence of its being a Purana or Itihasa, and of having come into existence later than some at least of the Puranas.

## BOOK II.

### CHAPTER I.

We have done with the first chapter for the present. We will now proceed to study the second. It is desirable to give the reader some idea of the plan of this chapter. It is divisible into three parts. The first part comprises a geographical note on the location of Samanthe Panchaka of which the battle-field of Kurukshetra formed a portion. It contains also an arithmetical table about the numbers of all arms forming an Akshauhini, and a few eulogistic verses on the Bharata, with a special recommendation to the reader's attention of the first three cantoes named Paushyam, Paulomam and Astikam.

The second part enumerates in detail the Parvas or cantoes of the Mahabharata by their titles. This part will be referred to hereafter as the preliminary enumeration.

The third part gives a detailed account of the contents of each of the eighteen Books into which the epic has been divided of which more will be said hereafter. The reader has to be cautioned about the use of the word Parva which is the indetical word used to represent both the cantoes, of which there are more than a hundred, and the Books which are eighteen in number. Each Book may comprise a large number of cantoes.

It will be convenient to designate the cantoes as Antahparvas.

In the first part of the second chapter there are a few verses of which we should take note :—

यत्तु शौनक सत्रे ते भारताख्यान मुत्तमम् ।

जनमेजयस्य तत्सत्रे व्यासशिष्येण धीमता ।

कथितं विस्तरार्थं यशोवीर्यं महीभृताम् ॥

“And this best of stories, this Bharata, which in thy Satrayaga, O, Saunaka! (was recited), this was recited in Janamejaya's sacrifice. ....”

It must be remembered that we are now at the very outset; the recitation of the Mahabharata has not been started yet. That being so, to speak of the recitation in the past tense as of an act already completed sounds very strange. It looks as if this verse had been removed from some epilogue of the Bharata and placed here.

The special mention made of the first three cantoes पौण्यम्, पौलोमम् and आस्तीकम् requires examination. It was solely due to the solicitude of the interpolator.

It is easily shown that they did not form part of the Bharata recited by Vaisampayana to Janamejaya. That Bharata does not begin until after the close of the third of the above cantoes, if indeed it begins there.

As they did not form part of the Bharata, which admittedly was put forward as Vaisampayana's, special mention was made of them to extol their merits.

The Sauti says to the Rishis :—

अनाश्रित्येतदाख्यानम् कथां भुवि न विद्यते ।

आहारमनपाश्रित्य शरीरस्येव धारणम् ।

तदेतद्भारतं नाम कविभिस्तूपजीव्यते ॥

“There is no story in the world that is not somehow connected with the Bharata story, connected in quite the same way as the body of a living being with the food by which it is sustained.”

‘All poets draw their inspiration from this Bharata,’ (or make their living by it). All this may be true. But how did the Sauti come to say it to the Rishis before he started the recitation of the Bharata? He had just returned from Kurukshetra. The only occasion on which he heard the Bharata recited was at the recitation by Vaisampayana in Janamejaya's Court. He left soon after on a tour of pilgrimage. What time elapsed before the Bharata stories got widely disseminated in the world and before the epic became the “Gesta Romanorum” of the Indian poets and Dramatists. ?

Judging from our knowledge of history, we are justified in taking that several centuries should have elapsed before the conditions indicated by the Sauti could have supervened. It follows that these verses, eulogising the Bharata, could have been appropriately written only after the epic had been redacted in some form and had become well-known.

Proceeding to the second portion of this chapter, we find the Sauti enumerating the Antahparvas by their titles. There is ample reason to believe that the original division of the Bharata, in the first form of the redaction, was only into (*Antah*)parvas. The division, since developed into eighteen books, was then unknown. When this second division was taken in hand the Antahparvas were assorted into the several Books. It is not clear that, when the text was first divided into

Books, the number of the latter was eighteen. There are probabilities pointing to the number of the Books having been less. Nor is it clear that all the matter that we now find in the eighteen Books was then available.

The Sauti's enumeration gives about 130 Antah-parvas to the whole of the Bharata, but winds up with the remark that they are a hundred in number. These two statements cannot be reconciled. If there were really 130 parvas why should the total be stated as one hundred. Why should a false statement have been made or how was it required?

एतत् पर्वशतम् पूर्णम् व्यासेनोक्तं महात्मना ।

यथावत् सूतपुत्रेण लौमहर्षणिना ततः ।

उक्तानि नैमिशारण्ये पर्वान्यष्टादशैवतु ॥

'The whole extent of this century of Parvas was told by the great Rishi Vyasa, exactly as the eighteen Books were later recited in the Naimisha forest by the son of the Suta, Lomaharshana'.

There is here a suggestion that the hundred cantoes and the eighteen Books are co-extensive and cover identical ground, a matter to which we shall advert again.

The main fact is apparent that the number of the cantoes is stated to be one hundred but the enumeration discloses about thirty more.

It is probable that, in the earliest form of the redaction, the epic, to which the impress of the scholars was given, comprised no more than a hundred cantoes; that, subsequently, the number was increased

by occasional interpolations; and that, though the references in the enumeration were increased to take in the interpolated matter, the traditional total, as stated at the close, was retained for obvious reasons.

There is another matter, connected with the verses cited above, which requires some attention. The 2nd chapter is addressed to the Rishis of the Naimisha forest. The speaker is the Sauti.

He has already surprised us by saying that he had done reciting the Bharata before he had made a start at all. There is more of this sort of surprise in the verse given above.

The verse is a speech from the mouth of the Sauti. So we have it thus:—

The Sauti:—"The eighteen Books were recited in the Naimisha forest, by the son of the Suta, Lomaharshana."

In the first place the recitation is spoken of as a thing of the past. In the second place, the Sauti speaks of himself in the third person as having made the recitation to the Rishis; and he says this prior to his starting the recitation at all, which, when made, would have been the first recitation of the epic in that forest-land.

This absurdity makes it clear that this chapter was taken from elsewhere and put in here and, with greater zeal than discretion, was put into the mouth of the Sauti.

There is another verse at the close of the enumeration, which may be conveniently studied here:—

हरिवंश स्ततः पर्व पुराणम् खिलसंज्ञितम् ।

विष्णुपर्वशिरो श्रया विष्णोः कंसवधस्तदा ।

भविष्यम् पर्वचाप्युक्तम् खिलेचैवाद्भुतम् महत् ॥

“ And then we have the canto of Harivamsa. which is spoken of as a lost Purana.

“ Vishnu Parva, the infant's doings, the slaying of Kamsa by Vishnu :—

“ The wonderful canto about revelation has also been told in that lost Purana ”.

The reader will recollect that these several cantoes are mentioned as the closing ones of the ‘hundred Parvas’. Now let us read again the 84th verse. If the suggestion is that the hundred Parvas and the eighteen Books are co-extensive, this is not correct. For the eighteen Books are confined to the matter of *the Bharata* proper.

The Vishnu Parva and the succeeding ones are outside the Bharata ; they formed, as early as we know, a lost or fragmentary appendix to the Bharata, included in the count of the hundred parvas. It is clear, therefore, that the hundred parvas include a good deal more than the eighteen Books do. And yet we shall see later on, that, in subsequent ages, the idea was promulgated that the eighteen Books and the hundred parvas covered identical ground. Now let us take the other piece of information that the Harivamsa was, at the time that the Sauti spoke to the dwellers in the Naimisha forest, a long lost document. And yet it was only a short time after the same had been recited by Vaisampayana to Janamejaya. The Sauti was present

at that recitation and doubtless learned it by heart. Vyasa the author, Vaisampayana his pupil, and that prodigy of Rhapsody, the Sauti, were all living and in excellent health. How did it happen that the Harivamsa had become a forgotten thing of the past. The Sauti speaks of it as one might in these days of some old play of the period of the English Queen, Elizabeth, known only by name and preserved in memory by its mention in some other record now extant, but itself lost for ever. The Sauti's mention of himself in the third person, his repeated reference to his own (future) recitation as a thing of the past, the reference to the Harivamsa as a lost Purana, make it clear that this Second Chapter must have been prepared long after the Bharata had been in vogue in some form and the Harivamsa, having been cut out as an unnecessary appendix, was left to *drift* for itself and became extinguished. It was hardly justifiable to make the Sauti the speaker of this chapter. And yet this had to be done to satisfy Puranic canons of authorship.

The mention of Harivamsa as a Purana implies its independent existence, at least for sometime before its disappearance; concedes its Puranic character and suggests the same of the main text of the Bharata. We may take it, then, that at the time that the Bharata was redacted, the Harivamsa had passed into oblivion and perhaps only a few fragmentary manuscripts were available. But the fact remains that we have a big Purana now known as the Harivamsa and claiming to be an appendix of the Mahabharata? It is evident that the place of the lost Purana has been ably supplied by a new text, amplified probably from some fragment extant of the lost original.



This gives a good indication as to how little we could depend on the antiquity of the Puranas extant.

## CHAPTER II.

Now let us go back to the number 100 of the cantoes. As stated already, this number is contradicted by the actual number of cantoes enumerated, which totals to about 130.

The reader has to be told that this is an important matter to which his attention should be directed.

Every chapter of the Mahabharata, as indeed of every Sanskrit work, winds up with a statement that it is chapter No. x of a certain Book or series etc.

According to the get up of the Bharata, we find a note, at the end of every chapter, that it belongs to such and such a *canto* and that it is Adhyaya no- of such and such a *Book*. The title-name of the canto as also of the Book is given. The chapters are separately numbered for each Book. For instance we find the postscript for a chapter, like this :—

आदिपर्वणि संभवपर्वणि अणिमाण्डव्योपाख्याने अष्टाधिकशतत  
मोध्यायः ॥

‘Chapter 108, being (part of) the story of Animandavya, in the Canto of Sambhava Parva, in the (First Book) Adiparva.’ The reader will appreciate the point of the investigation better when he is told, that, in spite of some want of uniformity as to the extent of each canto, the attempt of every copy in all the schools

has been to distribute the text in this manner among a hundred or ninety-nine or ninety-eight cantoes.

It is not to be understood that these postscripts are the work of modern editors. They are, I believe, as ancient as the redaction of the Bharata itself.

The actual total of the enumeration gives us 130. Why does the memorial verse understate the number and put it at only 100? Why do the postscripts stick to the number 100?

The only reasonable explanation is that, when the first redaction was taken in hand and sanctioned by the sacred college, the number of the cantoes was, in all probability, 100. This therefore became the traditional number and, for those who had to tamper with the text on the sly, it was necessary to avoid open ruptures. Interpolations would be put into the text and, after a time, catch-words would be put into the verses of the preliminary enumeration. That would amply serve the purpose. There was no call to amend the memorial verse any more than to awaken sleeping dogs.

The suggestion that the figure 100 was only an approximation or a rounding off cannot be admitted. 100 for 130 is too much of a rounding off and too little of an approximation and, more so, when one enumerates the items seriatim and winds up with a note purporting to be of the actual arithmetical total.

But this suggestion is put quite out of the way by the conclusive testimony of the postscripts, which sanction the figure only as a hundred and attempt to stick to it religiously. Another matter to which the reader's

attention should be drawn is that the names of some of the Books are identical with those of some of the cantoes. The reason of this will be explained below, but for the present it will be enough to keep in mind the fact that these names are identical. Another suggestion may be made about the hundred Parvas but is equally groundless. It may be said that the enumeration includes the names of the Books as also of the cantoes, that the number 130 is thus explicable. But it is not so easily explained. The scheme of the preliminary enumeration knows nothing of the division into Books, of which the first intimation is in the next part of this (the second) chapter. The preliminary enumeration speaks only of Parvas all of which are placed on the same footing.

And, again, of the eighteen Books, the titles of four, as we now know them, are not found in the canto enumeration, e. g. of Books, numbers I, VI, VII and XI.

It is therefore impossible to argue that the idea was first to give the name of the Book and then of the cantoes which go into it. If this were so the enumeration should have started with the title of आदिपर्व which is wanting, so that the argument breaks down in limine.

But let us try this suggestion in another way; if the argument were to prevail, the result would be that we should yet have as many as 116 canto-titles, which is 16 more than the traditional 100 or we should have only 86 in place of the traditional number 100, that is, 14 Parvas less.

And, besides, it is clear from the postscripts that no one ever understood this enumeration as this suggestion would have it. For in the postscripts, it is clear that the items of the enumeration were all regarded only as canto-titles and no others.

Another argument which may be offered has reference to the wording of the enumeration. The difficulty is easily seen by an example. Let us take two verses from the enumeration.

जरासन्धवधः पर्व पर्व दिग्विजयम् तथा ।  
पर्व दिग्विजयादूर्ध्वम् राजसूयिक मुच्यते ॥  
ततश्चार्चाभिहरणम् शिशुपालवधस्ततः ।  
द्युतपर्व ततः प्रोक्तं अनुद्युत मतः परम् ॥

‘Then comes the canto of the slaughter of Jarasandha and next to it the canto about universal conquest. The canto after it is entitled that of the Rajasuya. Then we have Arghabhiharanam and next the slaughter of Sisupala, then the canto of the game with dice, and thereafter Anudyutam.

It will be seen from the above that the word canto is either prefixed or suffixed to the title in some cases and is omitted in others, as in the case of Arghabhiharanam, Sisupala-vadha, and Anudyutam. If the argument is advanced that, in the case of those titles to which the word canto (Parva) is not prefixed or suffixed, they are not to be regarded as canto-titles, but only as descriptive detail, the argument is capable of refutation.

In the first place, the word canto (Parva) is specifically associated with only 72 titles. And this

number falls far below the hundred required. And again, the postscripts in the several editions all agree in admitting at least 34 of the other titles as cantoes included in the total of 100. And, if they were not canto-titles, they would not have been named in this series at all.

Therefore it is clear that none of the titles in the enumeration can be excluded on the ground suggested. They all stand on the same footing.

And what is equally decisive or more so is that the postscripts leave out some of the titles specified as Parvas. This is unaccountable and certainly indefensible. It was taking a liberty for which there was no authority and no justification. It must therefore be admitted that the actual enumeration was of 130 cantoes and represented designedly as of 100 cantoes. The explanation for this phenomenon, I venture to think, is as suggested above. It stands to reason to suppose that if, at the first redaction, the Bharata comprised 130 Parvas, there was no conceivable reason for not stating the correct number, or for cutting it down to 100.

There is another fact which deserves attention. Assuming that the name of a particular canto is maintained in the several editions, we may presume that it was so handed down from the beginning. But the security in this behalf goes no farther than the mere title. For as interpolations were introduced, they were fitted into some one canto or other. So that the canto-titles might remain just as before but the cantoes would swell in size. For instance, let us take the Sambhava

Parva; what is there to show the actual extent of this canto at the start? If interpolations were put into this canto, they would receive the impress of the postscripts to the effect that the interpolated matter forms Chapters, Nos. X, Y, Z of the Sambhava-Parva. The reason is apparent. The creation of a new title would at once mark it as new and spurious. It would increase the traditional number. The interpolation would begin to be doubted, and impugned sooner than was desirable; so that, there was a decided advantage in maintaining the canto-titles while simply adding new chapters. For after the lapse of time, tradition would grow up in favour of their genuineness. And when these chapters once got fixed in the text and passed current in the copies taken, there was no difficulty in giving them a recognition in the preliminary chapter, which is easily revised and transcribed.

At this distance of time and dealing with a dead language, it would not ordinarily be possible to separate the interpolation from the genuine text. The data available are naturally very meagre and of doubtful value. Sometimes, though rarely, some negative inferences suggest themselves. It would not be possible to speak with positive precision. Every sentence ought to be prefixed with a 'Perhaps'. To ascertain, as far as possible, the nature and extent of the interpolations, whether of chapters or cantoes or Books, is the task which the writer has set to himself in this study; and, for this end, the writer does not propose to travel out of the Bharata itself, but will base his conclusions mostly on what can be gathered from the text itself.

## CHAPTER III.

It is surprising that in this chapter we should first have the enumeration of the 100 (130) Parvas and then a very detailed account not of these Parvas but of the 18 Books into which the Bharata is divided. This arrangement is suggestive of two things. One, that the division into Parvas preceded by far the division into Books. If the division into 18 Books had been known in the first instance, this chapter would have been cast in a different form. The 18 Books would be enumerated and the detail of each would follow and might legitimately have included a mention of the cantoes into which each Book was divided. On the other hand it looks as if the attempt was to group the Parvas into Books.

Secondly, if the original division were into Books, the particular number of the minor Parvas would not signify much; and the importance or canonical character of the number 100 of the cantoes would not be a matter for insistence. There is another circumstance pointing the same way. In starting the detail of the contents of the 18 Books, in the third part of this chapter, the Adiparva or the first Book is the first dealt with. The author begins with regard to this Book with a statement as to which of the cantoes enumerated above (in the 2nd portion of this chapter) go to form this particular Book. The idea apparently was to allocate the several titles of the enumeration to the several Books. If that was so, it is much to be regretted that the author did not complete the detail of the other 17 Books on the same lines. He evidently felt the same difficulty in the matter of this assortment

as the present writer has. As the text stood, he could not always tell with certitude which canto he had to state as the first or which as the last of this or that Book. He had to face the further difficulty that there were cantoes in the text of this or that Book, of whose existence the preliminary enumeration did not give the least idea. Difficulties like these and *ejusdem generis*, as will appear later on, must have occurred to the author of the second chapter when he had to speak about the second Book itself. They did not confront him in the matter of the first Book. The result was that he cut himself short at the second Book. He discovered that it was a false start that he had made, and therefore from the second Book onwards he very prudentially abstained from telling us what Parvas went to make up any particular Book.

All this makes it apparent that the original division was only into cantoes and not Books.

It has to be noted that of the 130 actual titles, 5 belong to the appendix portion of the Harivamsa, so that we have 125 for the Bharata proper.

The traditional number however was 100 for the Bharata inclusive of Harivamsa. It was also part of this tradition that, of the 100 titles, 2 were appropriated to the appendix. The result was that for the Bharata proper the traditional number was 98, but, at the time when this chapter was written, the actual number was 127.

Let us see how the texts stand.

The postscripts of the Dravida edition count 98 cantoes to the Bharata proper, evidently allowing 2 for

the Harivamsa and Bhavishya portion. But of the 98 one is named Vaishnava Dharma Parva वैष्णवधर्मपर्व as the 3rd in the 14th Book. This title is not found in any of the other editions, nor is it known to the preliminary enumeration. And, in this instance, it is not a matter merely of a missing title, the text belonging to which however being found reproduced under some other canto-title,—a procedure of which we have several instances. It is the absence of the text itself. This canto, as we find it in the Dravida copy, comprises 23 chapters with about 1636 slokas. The whole of this canto is wanting in every other edition. It is an undoubted interpolation.

We have thus only 97 'genuine' cantoes to the Bharata proper in the Dravida edition. The Calcutta copy works out the Bharata in 99 cantoes. The Madras text based on Calcutta and Benares copies is uniform with the Calcutta edition as to the number and distribution of the Parvas.

(1) It appears that some liberty has been taken in writing out the titles of the Parvas for the postscripts. It is not clear why or how there should have been any variations in this respect and yet we do find variations. When we come to the 14th title in the Dravida copy, we find Vidurāgamanam विदुरागमनम् and Rajyārdhalābha राज्यार्धलाभः clubbed together into one Parva. This is opposed to the preliminary enumeration and to the arrangement in the Calcutta and the Madras texts, in all of which the two are recognised as two several cantoes. It is also opposed to the enumeration in the Telugu Bharata.

As to the closing chapters of the first Book or Adiparva, we find Khāndavadāha खाण्डवदाह and Maya Darsana मयदर्शन recognised as distinct Parvas in the Dravida text. But in the Calcutta and Madras copies the two are treated as but one canto. There is probably some justification for this in the text of the preliminary enumeration which says:—ततः खाण्डवदाहाख्यम् तत्रैव मयदर्शनम्, 'And then the Parva about the burning of the Khandava forest and therein or thereat also the appearance of Maya'.

It is noteworthy that the Telugu enumeration treats the two as distinct.

So that on the whole the several copies agree as to the number of Parvas 19 for the first Book.

(2) Passing to the 2nd Book we find a variation at the very start. The title of the preliminary enumeration roll, corresponding to the start of the 2nd Book, is Sabha Parva सभापर्व and the next one in order is मन्त्रपर्व Mantra Parva. But the Dravida postscript embodies only the latter title for both.

The Calcutta and Madras editions retain the first title in a modified form. In place of सभापर्व they write सभाक्रियापर्व. But at the same time they have admitted a new canto-title, not known to the preliminary enumeration, लोकपाल सभाख्यानपर्व or the canto in which the mansions of the deities of the cardinal points are described, seriatim, in detail. The matter appertaining to this canto-title goes in the Dravida text under the title of मन्त्रपर्व Mantra Parva.

The 2nd canto named in the postscript of the Dravida text is Jarasandhavadhā Parva जरासन्धवधपर्व or the slaughter of Jarasandha, but in the Calcutta and Madras editions we find a new title interposed राजसूयारम्भपर्व, or the canto of the commencement of or preparation for the Rājasūya sacrifice. This title is not found in the preliminary enumeration.

Apart from these variations we find in the Dravida copy 8 cantoes for the 2nd Book and 10 in the Calcutta and Madras editions.

(3) Proceeding to the 3rd Book, the first canto in the Calcutta and Madras copies is Aranyaka Parva आरण्यकपर्व. This is correct according to the preliminary enumeration. But in the Dravida text this title does not appear. The chapters appearing under it in the other copies are found in the Dravida under the title Kimmira-Vadhā-Parva किम्मीरवधपर्व, which appears there as the first canto. Whereas in the other texts and the Preliminary enumeration Kimmira-vadhā is the title of the 2nd canto. There are 10 chapters to Aranyaka Parva and one to Kimmiravadhā-Parva in the Calcutta text. But in the Dravida copy all the 11 appear as chapters of Kimmiravadhā-Parva.

Barring this variation, the titles of the postscripts to the end of the 3rd Book agree in the several copies. They also agree in discarding one title found in the preliminary enumeration, इन्द्रद्युम्नोपाख्यानम्, the story of Indradyumna.

Looking at the enumeration in the Telugu Bharata, we find important matter for reflection.

The canto-titles नलोपाख्यानम् Nalopakhyana, मृगस्वप्नोद्भव Mrigaswapnodbhava, रामोपाख्यान Ramopakhyana, and पतिव्रतामाहात्म्यम् Pathivratamahatmyam, are wanting and the century of cantoes in the Telugu enumeration has been made up without them. This is very surprising. The matter in the text appertaining to these titles, .i. e, the stories themselves, are all reproduced in the Telugu translation; but in the hundred names of the Telugu enumeration, these four do not appear. Leaving out Mrigaswapnodbhava, a mere children's fable of one chapter, (which however should not matter) advanced to the dignity of a canto, the other three are very important episodes, universally known. How does it chance that in the Telugu enumeration they do not find a place? These titles are disclosed in the Sanskrit Preliminary enumeration. They are adopted in the Sanskrit postscripts. The chapters relating to the titles are found in the Telugu text duly translated. How then does it happen that the Telugu Preliminary enumeration does not state these titles? The Telugu Bharata has an additional canto-title connected with the 3rd Book named प्रायोपवेशनम् Prayopavesanam. This comes after Ghosha-yātrā Parva घोषयात्रापर्व. In the preliminary enumeration of the Dravida copy there are two cantoes named प्रायोपवेशनम् Prayopavesanam and मन्त्रनिश्चयम् But this reading is wanting in the other texts.

So that, in the result, we find the text appertaining to 23 canto-titles named in the preliminary enumeration appropriated to the 3rd Book and distributed in the

Dravida copy among 21 cantoes, in the Calcutta and Madras editions among 22.

In place of the 23 titles of the Sanskrit enumeration the Telugu has only 16.

(4) The 4th Book consists of matter covered by 6 of the titles of the Preliminary enumeration. Of these the 1st, वैराटं Vairatam, is not adopted in the postscripts. But this title is also to be found in the Telugu enumeration.

The Sanskrit texts accordingly divide the 4th Book into 5 cantoes. The Telugu enumeration however leaves out two titles found in Sanskrit पाण्डवप्रवेशः Pandavapravesa and समयपालनम्, and names only 4 which can be claimed for this Book.

(5) The 5th Book discloses considerable divergence. The titles of the Preliminary enumeration that should go into this Book are as many as 23. We find however the text of this Book actually divided in the several editions into no more than 10 Parvas or cantoes, as to which they are all in complete accord. 13 of the titles of the Preliminary enumeration have therefore been discarded. Some of these 13 titles are wanting in the fuller sense, that is to say, the stories themselves are wanting in the text. How this has happened does not appear.

(a) The wanting portions are सावित्रम् and वामदेव्यम् as named in the reading of the Dravida copy, or सावित्रवामदेवम् as named in the other texts.

(b) वैन्योपाख्यानम्,

(c) जामदग्न्यमुपाख्यानम्,

(d) पर्व षोडशराजकम्,

(e) श्वेतोपाख्यानम्.

(c) It is probable that, in the case of one of these जामदग्न्यमुपाख्यानम्, an argument, seemingly plausible, may be raised that it exists in the text of this Book. The mention of Jamadagnya occurs twice in this Book. In the first instance Jamadagnya, the Rishi-Avatar, gives some advice to Duryodhana by relating to him the story of a certain royal personage of the name of Dambhodhbhava (certainly a made up name). This King was great in his time as a ruler and conqueror, but in the end he got tired of the vanity of human and mundane things.

This story, whatever its moral, cannot answer the description of an upakhyanam of Jamadagnya. This word implies only a story of which Jamadagnya is the hero. It should be a narrative of his life-history, more or less full in outline. It cannot mean a story narrated by him of somebody else; and besides, in the context in which we find it, the title जामदग्न्यमुपाख्यानम् cannot mean anything else. The second time we meet with Jamadagnya in the 5th Book is in Ambopakhyanam, अंबोपाख्यानम्, the very last portion of this Book. He there appears as the knightly champion of the injured princess Amba and fights against his own pupil Bhishma in her interest. The objection to accept this episode as Jamadagnya-upakhyana is two-fold. One objection is that, according to all intents, it is the canto of Ambopakhyanam, expressly named in the preliminary enumeration as well

as the postscripts. For, the Preliminary enumeration gives evidence of two cantoes, one by the name of Jamadagnyam and the other of Ambopakhyanam. A second objection is that the Preliminary enumeration, which implies also a settled sequence, puts several titles between this Jamadagnyam and Ambopakhyanam so as to make it impossible to identify them in conceit. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the real upakhyanam or what may pass for it appears in proper form in the 3rd Book, into which a large number of similar Upakhyanams has been conveniently grouped.

(a) There is no such canto as सावित्रवामदेवम् in this Book. Something answering to that description is found in the 3rd Book, for which it had not been named.

(b) nor do we find वैन्योपाख्यानम्. Something that does not answer to the description is found, not in this Book, but in the 3rd.

(d) The canto about the brief history of the sixteen Kings पर्वषोडशराजकम् is actually found in the 7th Book and is wanting in the 5th.

(e) श्वेतोपाख्यानम् which is missing, equally with the rest, has caused some difficulty. I am not aware that any Swetopakhyanam is to be found in the Bharata at all. It is not certain that the reading is correct. One edition reads विश्वोपाख्यानम् as to which I should state that this story either is not found in the 5th Book. But a certain विश्वोपाख्यानम् is found in the 6th Book and this may be the one here referred to. There is a Swetopakhyanam in the Uttara Ramayanam, the

spurious continuation of the well-known Ramayana, and in some Puranas. Anyhow it does not appear that श्वेत had an alias as विश्व. The result is that five of the cantoes are completely missing; of these five, one is not to be found in the Bharata at all, two are inserted in the 3rd Book, one occurs in the 6th and one in the 7th.

How did these changes come about. Who shifted these episodes from their proper places in the 5th Book.

It is probable that when the text came to be assorted into the 18 (?) Books, the redactors took the liberty of shuffling the cantoes and making deals as suited their ideas. For, they knew very well, it really mattered nothing whether a certain upakhyanam was placed in one Book or another.

This will explain the reason why, when the compiler came to give the detail of the 2nd Book and onwards, he thought it better not to say anything as to which of the cantoes of the preliminary enumeration went into which Book of the collection. The Telugu Bharata enumerates 11 cantoes for the 5th Book. This number is one more than the Sanskrit editions allow. The additional title is कर्णविवादपर्व found in the Sanskrit preliminary enumeration, but left out in the postscripts. The other titles named in the Telugu Bharata are the same as those in the Sanskrit postscripts.

A comparison of the sequence of the arrangement of the Parvas in the texts with the order in which they stand in the Preliminary enumeration betrays also some liberty taken by the redactors, for reasons of their own,



in rearranging the chapters. In the enumeration, the रथातिरथसंख्यानपर्व stands before उलूकदूतागमनपर्व. But in the text we find these two Parvas changing places, and the chapter about कर्णविवाद which occurs in the enumeration three places above the last canto, actually stands in the text next above it.

(6) Passing on to the 6th Book, the titles of the Preliminary enumeration relating to this Book are five. Of these, the first is left out in the actual division of the text in the several editions. It is the title भीष्माभिषेचनपर्व. Why this title was discarded in the postscripts is not clear. The actual division of the text of this Book is thus into 4 cantoes only.

When we look into the text in the proper place, we find that भीष्माभिषेचनम्, or the consecration of Bhishma as Generalissimo, was completed in the 5th Book. But the Preliminary enumeration suggests that that canto was treated as going with the four others which are now all in the 6th Book; and, in the enumeration, it does not come in until after अंबोपाख्यानम्, the last canto of the 5th Book, is passed. Here then, it is evident that this canto was made to shift its place at the instance of the redactors. There is every reason why it should be placed at the beginning of the 6th Book and not where it now occurs in the 5th. In the Telugu enumeration all the five titles of this Book are reproduced, but with a variation of sequence. In the Sanskrit enumeration, the first title is भीष्माभिषेचनपर्व. In the Telugu enumeration it is noted as the third canto. As a matter of fact, in the Sanskrit text, we do not meet with Bhishma's generalship, until after the first two cantoes are passed.

(7) Let us proceed to the next Book which is the 7th, entitled Drona Parva, द्रोणपर्व. This Book presents no difficulty. The titles of the Preliminary enumeration apportioned for this Book, are all reproduced in the postscripts and in the same sequence. The Telugu enumeration is also in accord.

(8) The next Book is the 8th, Karna Parva, कर्णपर्व. It is a matter for surprise that there is only one title in the Preliminary enumeration with which this Book can be associated. That title is the identical one, कर्णपर्व, the same name being given both for the canto and the Book.

There are 96 chapters to this Book. In the postscripts these chapters are all treated as belonging to only one canto and the same.

From the large number of the chapters, and the variety of topics, there was room enough, at least from the example of the two previous Books, for a plurality of cantoes.

We had cantoes for भीष्माभिषेचनम् and द्रोणाभिषेचनम्.

Why was not a canto recognised for कर्णाभिषेचनम्?

Why was the well-known Puranic story of त्रिपुरोपाख्यानम्, wedged into this Book, rigorously left alone? Why was no title supplied for कर्णशल्यसंवाद, a matter of 10 or 11 chapters, when we find this honour accorded to कर्ण भीष्मसंवाद in the 5th Book? Why, at least, was there no separate recognition of युधिष्ठिरार्जुनसंवाद which might have ended so fatally for all concerned in certain other events?

Why was not a Parva allotted for संकुलयुद्ध? Why no Parva for कर्णवध as we had for भिष्मवध or द्रोणवध? And yet Karna was the only one on the Kaurava side of whose prowess and skill the Pandavas were in great fear. It was to acquire the strength needed to prevail over him by superiority of arms that Arjuna made Tapas; and it was to disarm this hero, in the interests of the Pandavas, that the God Indra basely tricked Karna out of his armour and the earrings. It looks as if at one time this Book was of considerably humbler pretensions and, in that condition, probably formed a part of the next Book even after the division into Books was taken in hand. This canto was then taken out by itself and largely amplified and erected into a Book. This proceeding probably took place at a late stage and the matter was allowed to stand as it does now.

(9) Proceeding to the 9th Book, this is Salyaparva शल्यपर्व. The cantoes of the Preliminary enumeration, which may be claimed for this Book, according to the matter comprised in it, are four. These four titles are repeated in the Telugu Bharata. But the Sanskrit texts have divided this Book into only 3 cantoes. The last of the four titles सारस्वतपर्व has been left out in the division according to the postscripts. The first title शल्यपर्व has been varied into शल्यवधपर्व.

(10) There is no difficulty about the next Book, that is, the tenth. The Sanskrit versions divide the Book into two cantoes, the titles of which are a reproduction of those in the Preliminary enumeration. The Telugu Bharata would appear to treat, as belonging to this

Book, one canto जलप्रदानिकपर्व which, in the Sanskrit postscripts, is included in the next Book.

(11) The next Book, that is, the eleventh, named श्रीपर्व, presents difficulties which cannot be easily got over. The Sanskrit copies divide the Book into 3 cantoes. But the Preliminary enumeration gives at least 5 titles which ought to go into this Book. If we take जलप्रदानिकम् as comprised in this Book, on the authority of the postscripts, then we should have 6 cantoes named in the Preliminary enumeration to go into this Book. But, as the postscripts disclose only three titles, it follows that in the copies three titles have been ignored. These are चार्वाकवधपर्व, राज्याभिषेकपर्व, गृहप्रविभागपर्व.

The reader will be surprised to find that, in the case of the titles which are missing, the matter also is wanting in the text. An examination of the next Book discloses the fact that the compilers of the Mahabharata removed the three cantoes named above from the eleventh Book and put them into the twelfth. But even there, where they now stand, they have no independent existence. The postscripts regard them only as chapters, not cantoes. They appear as chapters of the first part of the 12th Book, राजधर्मानुशासनपर्व, though they have absolutely no connection with the contents of that Book in any way that is justifiable.

One reason may be suggested for this change of place. The narrative of the Bharata really closes with what is now the eleventh Book; and, at one time, the Bharata must have closed in the same way, with the

last chapter of this Book describing the enthronement and coronation of Yudhishtira.

[The last 7 Books were later additions of the Sacred College.]

The want of connection between the 11th Book and the 12th, if the former were allowed to be complete in itself, would be very apparent. There would be no excuse for starting the 12th Book at all. To provide this excuse, it is probable that the closing cantoes of the 11th Book were removed from their proper place and forced into the 12th Book.

This Book, as will be apparent from a glance at the contents, is supposed to begin with राजधर्मानुशासनं, that is, a dissertation on the धर्म of Kingship or royalty, a treatise on polity. The discourse purports to have been delivered by the wounded Bhishma awaiting his death. But the discourse does not begin except at the 55th chapter (Dravida copy). It is clear that the first 54 chapters are extraneous to the design and purpose of this Book. The missing cantoes of the eleventh Book stand as chapters 36-37-39 and 43 of the राजधर्मानुशासनपर्व of the 12th Book.

It was stated above that the postscripts show the जलप्रदानिकपर्व as a canto of the 11th Book, though it appears to have been intended to go with the cantoes named for the 10th Book. I have to add that, in view of the great probability that the titles of the Books were drawn from those of cantoes, the first canto of the 11th Book should have been खीबिलापः; and, if that was so

जलप्रदानिकम् should certainly have been the last canto of the 10th Book and not the 1st of the 11th.

(12) We now proceed to the 12th Book. It is named शान्तिपर्व. The Preliminary enumeration has about 8 titles which should have gone into this Book. But the Sanskrit copies are in accord in giving for this Book only 3 cantoes. The Sanskrit postscripts, therefore, have left out five titles.

The matter appertaining to three of these five titles, Viz, शान्तिपर्व, शुकप्रभ्राभिगमनम्, ब्रह्मप्रभ्रानुशासनम्, is embodied in the text under the other three titles. But the matter of the two other missing titles, प्रादुर्भावश्चतुर्वीसः, संवादश्चैवमायया, is certainly wanting.

(13) The next Book is the 13th, आनुशासनिकम्. It was designed as a continuation of the moral and religious discourses of the 12th Book. The Sanskrit postscripts and the Preliminary enumeration are in accord in the division of this Book into two cantoes. The second canto is a surprisingly small one, consisting of only one chapter, in which is recorded the passing away of Bhishma, who, like Nestor, had lived during three generations of men.

According to the Preliminary enumeration and the acceptance of the Calcutta postscripts, we see that the title of the 1st canto is आनुशासनिकं. We find however in the Dravida text this title changed into दानधर्मपर्व. The reason of the change is not apparent. The Telugu enumeration also knows only of आनुशासनिकम्.

(14) The next Book is the 14th, that is, the Aswamedhaparva. The titles of the Preliminary enumeration corresponding to this Book are two. The Telugu enumeration also agrees. These two are अश्वमेधपर्व and अनुगीतापर्व. They occur without change of name in the division of the text in all the Sanskrit copies. The Dravida text however is unique in the inclusion of another canto, entitled Vaishnava Dharma Parva, वैष्णवधर्मपर्व; a canto of 23 chapters and about 1636 slokas. This portion of the text is not found in the other copies and is, as suggested above, see page 120, an undoubted interpolation.

(15th, 16th, 17th, 18th) Books.

There is no difficulty with the last four Books.

The 15th Book is named आश्रमवासपर्व. The titles of the Preliminary enumeration appropriated for this Book are three in number, and the Sanskrit postscripts divide the text of this Book into these three cantoes.

The 16th, 17th and the 18th Books are three severel 'chapters' dignified as Books. In this respect they stand singular. Prior to this we had seen single chapters as cantoes. But in the case of the last three Books, it is a longer leap; for, the chapter has been changed into a canto and also into a Book. Each chapter is thus both a canto and a Book by itself. The Preliminary enumeration, so far as the Mahabharata proper is concerned, ends here.

We have now to deal with the lost appendix of Harivamsa हरिवंश and भविष्यपर्व. There are five

cantoes in all:—(1) Harivamsa (2) Vishnuparva, (3) the doings of the Infant Prodigy, (4) the slaughter of Kamsa by Vishnu and (5) the canto of Revelation of the future.

The Telugu enumeration gives only two cantoes. According to the translator there are 98 titles to the Bharata proper and two to the appendix.

#### CHAPTER IV

The Preliminary enumeration which we have above reviewed is the real पर्वानुक्रमणी or पर्वानुक्रमणिका. The reader is requested to note that the chapter or canto-title, पर्वानुक्रमणी, is now found associated with the first chapter of the present Bharata. We have seen above that this first chapter of the Bharata is not concerned with the enumeration or sequence of *the cantoes* of the Bharata. In portions it may have dealt with a rough outline of *the narrative or fable* of the Bharata. But it certainly does not give a list of the cantoes or their sequence.

It was therefore a misnomer to call it by a name which really belonged to what is now part of the 2nd chapter. The change seems to have been brought about in this way. The first chapter of the present Bharata was a very late interpolation. The text had been redacted before that in some form.

What is now the 2nd chapter was at that time really two chapters. The portion now dicussed, dealing

with the sequence and enumeration of the cantoes, was the first chapter of the Bharata and named **पर्वानुक्रमणिका**.

The succeeding portion of the present 2nd chapter (which we shall presently take up for study), *ie* the portion dealing with the detail of the 18 Books into which the text is divided—then stood as the second chapter, named **पर्वसंग्रहपर्व**. When, however, *the present first chapter* was brought into existence and tacked on to the redacted Bharata at its head, as a sort of preface, prudence suggested to the compilers that it was desirable to veil it under the name of **पर्वानुक्रमणिका**, and to club the first two chapters as they then stood into one, which would necessarily go with the postscript **पर्वसंग्रह**.

The 2nd chapter, so re-constructed, is the present 2nd chapter which we are now studying. This arrangement secured for the new—fangled first chapter authoritative sanction, at the same time that no addition was made to the number of cantoes or chapters.

There can be no doubt that the present 2nd chapter, after its first reconstruction, must have been revised more than once. In what exact form it existed originally can only be a matter for conjecture. There is another circumstance which has to be borne in mind. The fact that we now find the Parvasangraha **पर्वसंग्रह** portion of the 2nd chapter, dealing with the detail of the 18 *Parvas* or Books, offers no evidence that, in the earliest form, the original of this Parva-sangraha also dealt with the 18 *Parvas* or Books and not with the hundred *Parvas* or cantoes. The probability is that, as originally conceived by the authors, the **पर्वानुक्रमणी**

or Preliminary enumeration dealt with the enumeration of the titles of the hundred cantoes and the Parvasangraha with the detail of the contents of these cantoes. As the division into Books covered the same ground, there was no difficulty in establishing the sangraha-detail of the cantoes as the sangraha of the 18 Books.

The value of the Telugu Preliminary enumeration for critical purposes cannot be understated. We will therefore consider it a little more in detail.

To avoid confusion it is desirable that the reader should be helped to obtain a correct idea of the position of the Telugu translation.

The author purports to translate the Sanskrit **पर्वानुक्रमणिका** and **पर्वसंग्रह** or what is now the 2nd chapter of the Bharata or what, in his time, (first half of the eleventh century A.D.), corresponded to the same.

It should be understood that the cantoes he enumerates are the *cantoes of the original Sanskrit composition* and not of his own translated text. It should also be noted that the Telugu translation does not reproduce the Sanskrit postscripts.

The Telugu is divided into cantoes of the author's own arrangement. Several cantoes of the original Sanskrit might be found condensed in one canto of the Telugu.

The preliminary enumeration of the Telugu text was therefore started with the sole purpose of informing the Telugu readers of the names and number of the cantoes of the original Sanskrit composition. Hence its value.

As stated above, the Telugu translators of the Bharata were three poets of three different periods. The Preliminary enumeration, the first two Books, and a large portion of the third Book, were rendered by the earliest of them.

The Telugu text names only 100 cantoes for the entirety of the Sanskrit original, including the appendix, to which latter two out of the hundred cantoes are assigned. So that 98 were appropriated to the Bharata proper. The first thing to be noticed is that the Telugu has left out about 30 titles of the Sanskrit enumeration. The reader should not suppose that in the case of the missing titles, the matter is perhaps wanting. No, it is not so. The matter existed at the time of the translators. It is all duly translated. But the titles are not to be found in the Telugu enumeration. This is very much like what we noticed in the case of the Sanskrit enumeration, in which we find 30 extra titles imbedded, which are not reproduced in the postscripts, though the stories commanded by those titles are all in the text. The explanation however in the two cases is somewhat different. The Telugu enumeration does not, as the Sanskrit does, give 130 titles and wind up with the number 100. This contradiction in terms did not either exist in the text of that period or the absurdity, which must have been apparent on the face of it, must have been noticed.

One thing is certain, however, that 100 was the traditional number and neither the number nor the tradition could be got over.

A comparison of the Sanskrit with the Telugu enumeration discloses serious variation.

For, at least 30 titles have been left out in the Telugu, among them some which are so important that, if they existed in the original, they should not have been omitted at all, as to omit them would have been unpardonable audacity.

Let us consider another suggestion. Did the Telugu author tabulate the postscripts of the Sanskrit text and prepare a list? We must assume this idea to have occurred to him, in view of the contradiction between the number of the cantoes actually found in the Sanskrit enumeration (*ie* about 130), and the fact that the postscripts enumerate about one or two less than a hundred cantoes. But when we compare the Telugu list with that of the Sanskrit postscripts we perceive at a glance material changes. It will be apparent that the Telugu author did not copy the Sanskrit postscripts. He left out about 8 canto-titles found in the postscripts. He added 8 titles not named in the postscripts. It is a matter for surprise that the titles which he has discarded are sanctioned both by the Sanskrit enumeration and by the Sanskrit postscripts.

We find, therefore, about 82 titles of the Telugu enumeration accord with the postscripts of the Sanskrit Bharata and no more.

This survey then leads us to ask ourselves:

1. Did the second chapter of the Sanskrit text, which we are now studying, run, as it does now, in the text which the translator had before him? or

2. Did it exist in the original in the form in which we find the Telugu enumeration? or

3. Did it exist in any other form? It is not possible to do more by way of answering these questions than by pointing out the difficulties, whichever way we may attempt the solution. Are we to take it that the translator, who seriously started to give a list of the cantoes, would have followed the text of the original or that he would strike out a new line for himself?

One thing is clear, it is not probable that the idea of the preliminary enumeration came original to him. Looking at his translation of this portion, it is in close harmony with the design of this chapter we are now studying. He has given his preliminary enumeration and followed it up with his rendering of the Parvasan-graha. It is therefore clear that the translator had a chapter very much like the present one in design and outline before him but perhaps not identical.

If the text was the same, as what we now possess, then, it is clear he did not copy it. Neither did he follow the lead of the postscripts. And yet, sure enough, he did follow some lead.

Did he take the liberty of making out a list on his own initiative? Did he consider himself free to do so? Is it probable that he would have done so? What then was the lead that he followed? This question will probably be never answered. At all events not in the near future. The mathematical impossibility of reconciling the identity of 100 with 100 still remains.

No attempt at harmonising can be successful. No commentator has attempted it. The effort of Bharata compilers, as evidenced in the postscripts, has been to reduce the number to a hundred only, clearly showing

their consciousness that 100 was the real traditional number.

The sequence of the titles in the Sanskrit enumeration is generally in accord with the arrangement of the cantoes in the text. But there are occasional variations. In some instances the variation may be of importance. In other cases though it may be of no consequence *where* a particular story is placed, yet the very fact that the compilers of the Bharata took liberties in the matter of the arrangement of the text is by itself a very significant circumstance.

In the enumeration we find पतिव्रतामहात्म्यम् named prior and रामोपाख्यानम् Ramopakhyanan named next. They both belong to the Vanaparva or the 3rd Book. But this order is reversed in the arrangement of the text. You have first रामोपाख्यान and then पतिव्रतामहात्म्यम्.

In the 5th Book, उद्योगपर्व, we find the canto about Ulukadutagamanam उलूकदूतागमनम् preceding रथातिरथसंख्यानपर्व. Rathatiratha Sankhyanaparva. But in the Preliminary enumeration they change places. Referring to the 6th Book, भीष्मपर्व, we find something requiring explanation. The Preliminary enumeration gives only a list of the cantoes by name, without any indication as to which of these cantoes form which of the 18 Books of the Bharata. The connection of these titles with each of the 18 Books is found out only from the arrangement of matter in the text and the detail of the postscripts. Except in one or two instances there is no particular difficulty, especially, in view of the fact that the name of a Book

was ordinarily drawn from the name of the first of its cantoes.

Bearing these facts in mind, we find that after **अंबोपाख्यान** the next title in the Preliminary enumeration is **भीष्माभिषेकपर्व**. Next to it comes **जंबूखण्डविनिर्माणपर्व**. The one after it is **भूमिपर्व**. Then comes **भगवद्गीतापर्व** and lastly **भीष्मवधपर्व**. The Sanskrit postscripts close **उद्योगपर्व** with **अंबोपाख्यानपर्व**. We should therefore look for the canto **भीष्माभिषेकपर्व** at the commencement of the 6th Book, **भीष्मपर्व**. But the difficulty is that this canto title **भीष्माभिषेकपर्व** is not recognised at all by the postscripts. This however may be overlooked, if the matter appertaining to it is found where it ought to be. But it is not there. Where then is this chapter to be found? The title means consecration of **भीष्म** as generalissimo.

We find it imbedded in the **उद्योगपर्व** considerably above **अंबोपाख्यान** and we learn from the postscripts that it is a chapter of the canto known as **रथातिरथसंख्यानपर्व**. If that was its proper place why was it mentioned in the enumeration next after **अंबोपाख्यानम्**? Let us turn to the Telugu enumeration. It leaves no room for doubt that **भीष्माभिषेकपर्व** belongs to the **भीष्मपर्व**, though the order in which it is named starts another difficulty. For, the Sanskrit enumeration has **भीष्माभिषेकपर्व**, **जंबूखण्डविनिर्माणपर्व** and **भूमिपर्व**. But the Telugu list places **भीष्माभिषेक** as the 3rd of the three cantoes named above. This is capable of explanation to which we shall

revert later. In connection with the 11th Book we come across another variation. The Sanskrit enumeration gives the titles in this order **श्राद्धपर्व**, **चार्वाकवधपर्व** and **धर्मजराज्याभिषेचनिकम्**. In the Telugu enumeration the last two titles change places.

Proceeding to the Harivamsa portion the postscripts fail us, for they relate only to the Bharata, the Harivamsa having very early ceased to form an integral portion of the Mahabharata. In the Telugu enumeration two canto-titles are appropriated to the Harivamsa, out of the hundred; so that we find allotted to the Bharata only 98 titles.

To sum up. It appears that the Telugu translator dealt with some version of the original, but it is not clear that the enumeration in the text used by him was quite like what we now find in the text in vogue.

Counting the number of postscripts, we find that the Dravida copy divides the text into 98 cantoes, suggesting that two should be assigned to the Harivamsa portion. The Calcutta and Madras copies have by accident or design divided the text into a hundred cantoes. How this can be justified is more than I can tell. For the traditional number 100 certainly included the Harivamsa portion for which we should allow 2 cantoes at least. The Telugu enumeration limits the Bharata proper to 98 cantoes. As regards the 98 of the Dravida division, it must be noted that one of them, Vaishnava Dharma Parva, is a very late interpolation; and, therefore, the real division of the Dravida, for a comparative statement, should be taken to be into only



97 cantoes. Throughout these notes, when I speak of an interpolation in this copy or that it should be understood that I am not imputing anything to the modern or present day publishers. They published the manuscripts as they found them. The interpolations are in most cases more than a thousand years old, and they were achieved by the persistence of successive generations of scholars who worked at the unification of all the Bharatas, of several authors, extant a thousand years ago (cir), and of several of the Puranas, doubtless with a high purpose and an idea that there was nothing very wrong about their *modus operandi* or, in other words, that the end justified the means.

To prevent the reader being led into a misconception in a certain particular I have to furnish a note. The reader has been told above that the order in the Telugu enumeration varies in some particulars from that in the Sanskrit; that some titles found in the Sanskrit list are wanting in the Telugu one; and that titles have been admitted into the list which do not find a place in the postscripts, though indeed they are named in the Sanskrit Preliminary enumeration. In these instances the reader should not understand that the text of the translation is to be found in accordance with the Telugu enumeration, any more than the Sanskrit text is, by comparison, with the Sanskrit enumeration.

The Telugu text exactly reproduces the Sanskrit in the order and sequence of chapter, and incident, as we find it in the published texts. And, where the Sanskrit texts vary, the Telugu appears to have been based on the Dravida copy.

It is this fact that considerably adds to the value of the Telugu enumeration for purposes of criticism.

It is clear that the Telugu enumeration was written out by the author in view of his undertaking to faithfully reproduce the Sanskrit, though with the knowledge that the arrangement of the Sanskrit text did not agree with the same; and with the knowledge that the enumeration he was giving would not agree with the text of the translation he was preparing. Of course, he should also have known, if the Sanskrit Preliminary enumeration stood as it does now, that he was designedly altering it. He did not alter it to suit the arrangement of the text as it stood in Sanskrit. He did not alter it with the idea of re-arranging the text in his translation to accord with his own enumeration; for, his text is, chapter after chapter, in accordance with the Sanskrit original. It is therefore impossible to conceive why or how he should have made an intentional departure, involving responsibility in double regard. Knowingly and willingly he prepared a list which did not accord with the Sanskrit Preliminary enumeration or with the Sanskrit postscripts or with his own translation of the text. Was that likely? The writer is of opinion that the Preliminary enumeration in Sanskrit has been revised since the time of the Telugu author; that the latter copied the text of the enumeration as he found it, though he knew it varied from the reality as found in the body of the epic.

His position can be conceived to have been one of great difficulty.

It is probable that, in some cases, he attempted to reconcile contradictions but was not able to do it. It is

probable that, in some cases, he justified the situation to himself with more or less plausibility. It is probable that, in some cases, he thought there was doubtless some way out of the difficulty, though he did not know of it just then; some clue, that would unravel the maze, of which he was not then in possession. Whatever the contradiction or absurdity was, it was the work of Vyasa. But Vyasa was eternal and an incarnation of Vishnu; was it for this Brahmin poet to question the propriety of Vyasa's composition? Certainly not. He would render into Telugu what he found in the Sanskrit enumeration and the Sanskrit text, and leave it to Vyasa to justify all. This, in brief, was probably the attitude of the Telugu poet. The text of the Sanskrit Bharata had been redacted, probably, though we cannot say with assurance, finally, and almost all of the interpolations admitted into this huge hotch-pot of centoism, before the Telugu author's time. But the first two chapters had probably not been completely revised with a view to making changes, additions and subtractions on the principle of *mutatis mutandis*, having due regard to the interpolations.

Before closing the study of the Preliminary enumeration, we may take note of the verification at the end of it.

एतत् पर्वशतम् पूर्णम् व्यासेनोक्तम् महात्मना ।

यथावत् सूतपुत्रेण लौमहर्षणिना ततः ॥

उक्तानि नैमिषारण्ये पर्वण्यष्टादशैवतु ।

समाख्यो भारतस्याय मन्त्रोक्तः पर्वसंग्रहः॥

"The entirety of these hundred cantoes was composed by Vyasa,

And a brief synopsis of the incidents of the Bharata is given herein, exactly as the matter of the 18 Books had been recited by the Sauti in the Naimisha forest, subsequently." Two things may be gathered from this.

(a) One, that the division into a hundred cantoes was the earlier idea, and that the division into 18 Books was a later idea.

That is to say, that the Bharata existed in the first form for some period which we cannot ascertain and that the form was changed subsequently into something like the present division into Books. For, there is reason to believe that even the number of the Books of the Bharata passed through several vicissitudes of fortune before it got fixed at 18.

(b) The other and a more important suggestion contained in the verses cited is that Vyasaknew nothing of the division into 18 Books. His division of the text was into a hundred cantoes. The division into 18 Books was the Sauti's work or the work of some predecessor of his. This is intelligible. The verse does not associate Vyasa with the 18 Books, but only with the hundred cantoes.

It seems to me that, before proceeding to the third portion of the 2nd chapter, it is desirable to summarise the results of what I consider to be fairly deducible from the discussion that has preceded.

1. The second chapter of the present Bharata was no part of Vyasa's Bharata.

2. In being rendered as the speech of the Sauti, it betrays an anachronism.

3. This chapter divides itself into the Preliminary enumeration *पर्वानुक्रमणिका* and the *पर्वसंग्रहः* Parvasan-graha.

4. The first chapter of the present Bharata is designedly misnamed as the '*Preliminary enumeration.*'

5. At one time of its history the Bharata was divided only into cantoes, of which the traditional number was one hundred.

6. At a later period the Bharata was divided into Books (the number of which reached 18 in a progressive scale of variation).

7. The number of cantoes was swelling from time to time by interpolations, but probably, at the period when the division into Books was taken in hand, the text was reconstituted so as to reduce the number of canto titles to the traditional number and indicate the same by the postscripts.

8. At the time that the final redaction of the Mahabharata was completed, the Harivamsa portion had become obsolete and lost, showing that the redaction was long after the compilation of the Bharata.

9. That the Purana now extant under the name of Harivamsa was a later forgery.

10. That the division in the postscripts of the text into cantoes does not accord throughout with the cantoes as named in the Preliminary enumeration.

11. That there is nothing to show the original extent of each canto (which at the start was probably synonymous with a chapter of varying length).

12. That the 2nd chapter in its present form is the result of repeated revision.

13. That the cantoes, as we now find them distributed among the 18 Books were not, at the start, distributed as now.

14. That when the division into Books was made most of the names of the Books were drawn from the title of the first canto allotted to them.

15. That of the hundred cantoes two were appropriated to the Harivamsa portion.

16. That some portions, which stood in the text as interpolations, previous to the final settlement of the text, were removed by the compilers and are now wanting.

17. That liberty was taken by the compilers in varying the sequence of the cantoes.

18. That the Vaishnava-Dharma-Parva, *वैष्णवधर्मपर्व*, which appears in the Dravida text as the 3rd canto of the 14th Book, was a very late interpolation.

19. That a comparison of the Telugu author's enumeration of the hundred cantoes with the Sanskrit preliminary enumeration, shows that, in the case of 17 or 18 canto-titles, the Sanskrit postscripts are of doubtful authority.

## CHAPTER V

Let us now proceed to the Parva-sangraha, the other portion of this chapter which remains to be

studied. I should give the reader an idea of the method of this portion of the second chapter.

The detail of the contents of each of the 18 Books is given with sufficient fulness. The number of the Book, as that it is the first or second, is stated. The name of the Book, as that it is the Sabhaparva or Vanaparva, and the number of chapters and the total number of slokas in each Book, are also given. There is a sort of colophon or verification at the end of the summary of most of the Books regarding the authorship of the particular Books by Vyasa.

There is no indication of the number or names of the cantoes comprised in any Book. An exception to some extent should be noted. In the case of the first Book or Adiparva, the cantoes forming the same are repeated by name. But this sort of information, which, if given regarding every Book, would undoubtedly have been of great value, is wanting, as pointed out already, in the case of the other Books.

A doubt arises as to whether this omission was made in original draft of this 2nd chapter; or whether these details, having originally found a place in the text of this chapter, were not removed by the revisers, at some later period, when the first two chapters were clubbed into one and converted into the 2nd chapter of the redaction. A comparison with the Telugu rendering of this portion of the 2nd chapter leads one to regard it as probable that the missing items of information existed in the Sanskrit text at one time.

Some notice of the method of the Telugu Parva-sangraha also is necessary. The detail of the incidents of each Book is given as in Sanskrit, also the number

of the Book, its name and the number of slokas in each Book.

The Telugu author has for some reason (probably he thought it unnecessary) omitted to give the number of chapters in the Books. But he has given some information, in addition to what we find in Sanskrit, which makes his record very valuable. He has stated by name and number the cantoes forming each Book of the original, in their proper sequence, according to his Preliminary enumeration.

And, what is more, he has named the first canto of each Book. So that we know, with reference to the Preliminary enumeration and without analysing the postscripts, where a Book begins and ends. Bearing in mind that this sort of detail was given in respect of the first Book in the Sanskrit sangraha, and that it is given throughout in Telugu, it is probable that the Sanskrit detail was in consonance with the Telugu account at some time. The reader should bear in mind that the Parva-sangraha of the Telugu author is not a sangraha of his translation, but purports to be a translation of the sangraha portion of the 2nd chapter of the Sanskrit Bharata. So that, the detail given in the Telugu is the detail of the Sanskrit original but not of the Telugu translation.

Whether the Telugu author had a more complete original before him or whether he discovered, from the example of the detail of the first Book, that a note about the cantoes in connection with each Book was contemplated and had better be supplied, he has in his summary given the number of cantoes in each Book,

indicating the first canto of each Book by name ; so that, when we know the first canto of each Book, and the number of cantoes of that Book, we can find out what they are by reference to his Preliminary enumeration in due observance of sequence.

The Telugu gives us a correct idea of the relation of the cantoes to the Books, which information has been withheld from us in the Sanskrit original either by accident or design.

Let us proceed with the Sanskrit Parvasangraha.

The first Book dealt with is the Adiparva. The summary, as stated already, starts with a narration of the canto-titles of the Preliminary enumeration included in this Book. 17 titles beginning with the 3rd of the Preliminary enumeration are named. The first two cantoes (or chapters) were evidently left out as prefatory though named in the Preliminary enumeration. The first canto is the first chapter of the Bharata, which we have already reviewed.

The 2nd canto is the identical chapter that we are now studying.

It seems to have been considered proper to treat the Bharata as commencing with the third canto named Paushya Parva. This arrangement embodies a suggestion that the first two chapters were a later introduction.

The first thing to be noticed in the detail of this Book, as given in this chapter, is that there is nothing said in it with respect to the canto named as the fourth for this Parva **आदिवंशावतारणम्** Adivamsavataranam,

It is treated as a chapter of the canto of **संभवपर्व**. Why should that be so? The difficulty does not end here. The Dravida copy reads **अंशावतारणम्** in place of **वंशावतारणम्**. The two titles are different. **अंशावतारणम्** deals with the incarnation of Devas, Asuras &c, in human forms. **वंशावतारणम्** deals with the ancestry and descent of the Pandavas and the Kauravas.

In the preliminary enumeration, in the several copies, the seventh canto named is Sambhava-parva.

The sixth named in the Calcutta Edition is **आदिवंशावतारणम्**. This name we find in the Dravida Edition altered into **आदिरंशावतारणम्**. As stated already, the Parvasangraha detail for the first Book starts with a list of the cantoes of the Preliminary enumeration appropriated for this Book. This list is, perforce, a copy of some of the items in the said enumeration. We have, therefore, again, in this second statement of the cantoes, the same difference between the Calcutta and the Dravida copies. The former as before reads **आदिवंशावतारणम्** Adivamsavataranam, and the latter, similarly, **आदिरंशावतारणम्**.

The following considerations lead to the conclusion that the correct reading should be **आदिवंशावतारणम्**

(1) Occurring as the name of the sixth canto, there is no propriety or justification for the word **आदि**: before **अंशावतारणम्**.

(2) In the further detail given in the Parvasangraha, we find it stated in both the editions that the story

indicated by अंशवतारणम्. Amsavataranam is given in the Sambhava Parva as a chapter of it.

But this Sambhava Parva is the next canto or the seventh and the matter of Amsavataranam, should properly be found in the sixth canto, if the Dravida reading should be taken as good.

(3) Referring to the text, we really find the matter indexed by the title Amsavataranam, as part of the seventh canto, the Sambhava Parva.

(4) The text of the sixth canto is the same and common to both copies. But it is really the matter relating to Vamsavataranam वंशवतारणम् and not the other one.

The colophon in the Calcutta copy is also to the same effect. But the colophon in the Dravida copy is contrary to the contents.

(5) The chapters at the head of the Sambhava Parva dealing with the matter of अंशवतारणम् Amsavataranam, are, in the Calcutta copy, acknowledged by the colophon as 'Amsavataranam, part of Sambhava Parva'.

The Dravida copy could not consistently do this, and has limited the post-scripts throughout the whole of the seventh canto to a bare recital of the canto title of Sambhava, without venturing into any detail.

The reading Adivamsavataranam is therefore preferable.

The detail in the sangraha of the first three canto titles (the 3rd, 4th and 5th of the Preliminary enumeration), as also of some other cantoes of this Book, is very

brief. The reason for this brevity cannot be conjectured. It is unfortunate that the very meagreness affords opportunities for arguments both ways. It may be said that all that we now actually find in the text of this Book was intended to be included. It may be advanced with equal plausibility that only a fraction of what we find in the text can really be covered by the indications in the detail (Parva-Sangraha).

The first title dealt with has this detail for it.

"In the Paushya-parva is set out the greatness of Utanka (or Uttanka)". If that was all, there is no excuse for the thoroughly independent and unconnected fables of Janamejaya-Sarama-Sapa, जनमेजयसर्माशाप, of Janamejaya's choice of a Purohit, and of the accounts of the Brahmin acolytes आरुणि, उपमन्यु and वैद. Be it noted that it is not until these irrelevant episodes close that the story of उत्तङ्क is started.

So that all the matter of this canto, occurring next above the start of Utanka's story, must be expunged, as not warranted by the Parva-sangraha.

As regards the second canto पौलोमपर्व, we are told that it is concerned with the generations of Bhrigu. That being so, it cannot include रुरुडुडुभसंवाद and डुडुभचरितम् which we now find in this canto.

The third canto is आस्तीकपर्व. When we compare the text of this canto with the detail of it in the sangraha, we find reason to believe that the former has been made to undergo considerable manipulation. The detail in the sangraha is to this effect

आस्तिके सर्वनागानाम् गरुडस्यच संभवः ।

क्षीरोदमथनं चैव जन्मोच्चैःश्रवसस्तथा ॥

थजतस्सर्पसत्रेण राज्ञःपरीक्षितस्यच ।

कथेयमभिनिर्वृत्ता भरतानाम् महात्मनाम् ॥

“In this canto (are narrated) the coming into existence of all the serpents and of Garuda ; the churning of the ocean of milk and the birth of the horse उच्चैःश्रवाः And this story of the illustrious Bharatas was narrated to the son of परिक्षित्, at the time when he was engaged in the sacrifice of serpents.”

Let us compare this table of contents with what we actually find in the text of this canto.

The detail gives no indication of the quarrel between विनता and कद्रूः Vinata and Kadrū ; or the fable of the slavery of the former and her redemption achieved by Garuda, her bird-son; nor is there any suggestion, in the detail, of the highly dramatic Sauparnopakhyanam सौपर्णोपाख्यानम्, covering, in chapters 23 to 34, the adventures of the Royal eagle in the world of the Gods, and his seizure of the Amrita ; his encounter with Indra and the discomfiture of the latter; the conclusion of an offensive and defensive alliance between them ; the subordinate alliance of Garuda with Vishnu and the trick played on the serpents to deprive them of the Amrita. This episode is quite independent of the motive for Janamejaya's snake-sacrifice on the one hand, and, on the other hand, of the main current of the fable regarding the curse pronounced on the serpents

by their unnatural mother and\* stated to have worked itself out in the sarpa-yaga.

The council meeting of the serpents debating about ways and means to evade the curse of their mother is an amplification of the idea of the curse.

The Preliminary enumeration gives little more than the title of the canto, and thus it offers no suggestion as to the original extent of it or of the interpolation. *The sangraha does not speak of this सौपर्णोपाख्यानम् in the detail.* The Telugu translator supplements what is defective herein by the mention in his detail of this episode.

The original design, in slipping in the canto of आस्तिकपर्व, seems to have been to introduce the matter of the सर्पयाग for the purpose of stating that the Bharata was there and then recited to the assemblage. This might involve the story in brief of Parikshit's death by the sting of the serpent. But it does not necessarily involve the story of the unnatural curse of the serpents by their own mother and the approval of the same by their father. It certainly does not involve the narration of the whole or part of the सौपर्णोपाख्यानम्.

The story of the birth of आस्तिक and of the सर्पयाग of the King Janamejaya, and the story of the intercession of आस्तिक on behalf his serpent cousins, is twice told in this canto, apparently without reason. There are other stories also repeated in this Book. Such repetitions occur very frequently in the Bharata. The reason can be suggested. It is very probable, almost amounting to

a certainty, that the first version of a story, which is generally brief, was all that the original cast contained. But later workers at the Bharata, not satisfied with the simplicity of the narrative and wishing to create opportunities for interpolation, took in hand the revision of the episodes, amplifying them in every way they conceived. This was done, sometimes by the contribution of an original composition, sometimes by centoism from other Bharatas, and oftentimes by wholesale incorporation of chapters from the Puranas. We may take it therefore that the repetition of a story or other matter affords a useful clue for criticism.

The excuse for the second version of a story is often no other than that the interlocutor would like to have a fuller narrative.

The story of Parikshit is also twice told. The first time it was the Sauti's own narration to Saunaka. The second time also the narrative was by the Sauti and also to Saunaka, but it is made to appear as reported speech-the repetition by the Sauti, of the account given to Janamejaya by his Brahmins and ministers, of the life-story of his father.

At the end of the आस्तीकपर्व, the text makes a fresh attempt to reach the beginnings of the Bharata. The Sauti there declares that he will start the Bharata story. The attempt to do this extends again over a few prefatory chapters, which will be studied later on. Those chapters leave no doubt whatever that the three cantoes of Paushya, Pauloma and Astika, are quite irrelevant, that they have nothing to do with the Bharata and that they are hieratic interpolations.

## CHAPTER VI.

The next canto of the first Book is **संभवपर्व**. This presents much difficulty. In the text of this canto we find two very important episodes or upakhyānam, **ययात्युपाख्यानम्** Yayatyupakhyānam and **शकुन्तलादुष्यन्तोपाख्यानम्**. First, as to the former,

(a) the detail of the **पर्वसंग्रह** in all the copies agrees as to the omission of all mention of this episode among the contents of the Sambhava Parva. Why was it omitted?

(b) Let us take into consideration the further fact, which perhaps if it stood by itself might be overlooked, that its actual place in the body of the text varies in the copies. In the Dravida text we find this episode extending from chapters 69 to 87. The 88th chapter speaks of **पुरुवंशम्**. The 89th chapter begins **शकुन्तलम्**, the other episode named above. Let us turn to the Calcutta text. Here the story of Sakuntala comes first in chapters 68 to 74 and is followed by Yayatyupakhyānam in chapters 75 to 93. The variation of place in the texts has necessitated a change of the verses heading off the initial chapters of these upakhyānam.

In the Madras and Bombay texts this episode of Yayati comes first, as in the Calcutta copy, and is followed by Sakuntalam.

(c) Let us take another fact, the importance of which cannot be overestimated. The Yayatyupakhyānam found in the Bharata is, word for word and line for line, a copy of what is found in the **मात्स्यपुराण**, where the



recital is by the fish-āvatar to Manu, the first man or king.

(d) Let us seek the aid of the Preliminary enumeration. Neither Yayatyupakhyanam nor Sakuntalam are mentioned therein. A suggestion to meet this objection may be made that they are not independent cantoes, but only parts of the canto of Sambhava parva which itself is mentioned.

No doubt that is how the text stands. But it certainly seems to me that, if they existed in the original text, they were of sufficient importance to deserve independent mention, instead of being included in the extremely vague title of Sambhava parva.

If the tale of उतङ्क which in no sense of the word is connected with the Bharata : if the story of a wretched demon or cannibal slain, which involves no history and points no moral : if Paulomopakhyanam, which is in nowise connected the Bharata and which goes no farther than explain the pedigree of Kanva who presided at the recitation by the Sauti ; if the adventure with a Gandharva, which has no higher claim on the reader's good sense than that of a fairy tale : if the transport of dowry and paraphernalia for a girl who eloped with her lover ; if the Aesop's fable of a protest by wild beasts in Yudhisthira's dream : if these and several other similar incidents stood high enough for canto-titles, in the preliminary enumeration, the two upakhyanams named above were, certainly, good enough to pass muster with the rest of the cantoes.

(e) In any event, mention of Yayatyupakhyanam was called for in the 'detail' (of the Parva Sangraha).

Sakuntalam is mentioned in the Parvasangraha ; Yayatyupakhyanam is not of lesser importance. It is a longer episode than the other one and covers 9 chapters more—altogether 19 chapters. The Parvasangraha detail makes mention of several minor negligible matters of this canto. How is it there was no room found for one line about Yayati ? I do not suggest that Sakuntala—Dushyantopakhyanam is genuine and original because it is mentioned in the पर्वसंग्रह, Parvasangraha ; but I am only discussing the effect of the negative evidence offered by the omission from the detail of Yayati's episode.

(f) Let us look at the 'detail' of the Telugu translator. He felt himself called on to make special mention of the Yayatyupakhyanam. But strange to say, he does not mention Sakuntalam. This is exactly the reverse of what we find in the Sanskrit detail. If the Telugu author regarded Sakuntalam as included in his phrase of भारतवंशानुकीर्तनम् which may be probable, it is clear that he did not regard Yayati as capable of being included therein ; this has led to his naming the latter independently. Therefore we may take it that the Sanskrit authorequally should have made mention of it.

It is clear to the writer that both these upakhyanams are interpolations and that Yayatyupakhyanam was probably of a later date in its entry into the Bharata than even the redaction of the 2nd chapter. As usual we have a brief and also an extended narrative of Yayati's history. It is thoroughly extraneous matter and the double infliction might have been spared.

The detail of the Sangraha as to the birth of Dhritarashtra and Pandu and their children is

extremely vague. धृतराष्ट्रस्य पाण्डोश्च पाण्डवानाम् च संभवः This is all the notice we have of the subject. Between this topic and the next वारणावतयात्रा Varanavata-yatra, there is an expanse of story which has not been included in the notice by the mention of even a catchword. In the text, however, we find very interesting and certainly also important matter, extending over 17 chapters. A brief summary would be useful. We have in these chapters the story of the juvenile military and athletic exercises of the adolescent Pandavas and Kauravas, of the repeated attempts of Duryodhana to make away with Bhimasena; the escape of the latter each time, and his visit to the (lower) world of the serpents; the story of the births and adventures of the Brahmin-military preceptors, Kripa, Drona and their next of kin; the martial exercises, prize competitions, mutual discord, envy and jealousy of the Royal youths; the history of the insult offered by Drupada to Drona and the humiliation to which Drupada was subjected by Drona through his pupils, in particular through Arjuna, by whom Drupada was taken prisoner in battle and made to part with one half of his kingdom; the coronation of Yudhishtira as heir-apparent; the aggressive campaigns of Bhima and Arjuna against the ruling princes of the four quarters of the globe; the alarm of Duryodhana at the growing power, prestige and influence of his cousins; his machinations to get rid of them; all this is passed over in silence in the Parva-sangraha with nothing to indicate the existence of these chapters in the text.

The Telugu Translator has supplied the want, for, he has said sufficient in his sangraha to give notice of the

above incidents. Is it probable that the compilers of this chapter were blind to the omission to which the attention of the Telugu author was drawn?

All the above could not have passed under the line cited above. Animandavyopakhyanam अणीमाण्डव्योपाख्यानम् which we find in the text of the Sambhava Parva is not referred to in the detail. It is doubtful whether we can take it as comprised in the reference to the incident that Dharma was born in human form as विदुर Vidura on account of the curse of Mandavya.

This would not require the setting out of the life-history of Mandavya. The Telugu translator appears to have perceived this and accordingly made special mention of अणीमाण्डव्योपाख्यानम् along with the reference to Dharma's incarnation in human form.

Passing on we find another serious omission. In the canto of खण्डवदाहपर्व Khandavadâhaparva, we find in the text, Indra and the Gods coming down to fight Arjuna and his seconds, Krishna (the Avatar). Indra was worsted in the fight. He then effected his retreat, after bestowing on his son Arjuna divine arms and accoutrements. This episode was put in to exalt Arjuna above Indra.

There is no reference to this episode of the affair between Indra and Arjuna in the Parva-sangraha, nor in the Telugu sangraha. It is not an episode to be ignored. It could not go under the title, Khandavadâha, which is concerned only with the conflagration of that extensive primeval forest. This episode is considerably

more important than what precedes it or succeeds in the same canto and of which there is mention in the 'detail'. It is not referred to in the preliminary enumeration. That it *ought to have been* referred to and *might have been* is apparent from the fact that the minor incident of मयदर्शनम् or the appearance of Maya, which is a chapter of this canto, is specially mentioned in the Preliminary enumeration in the line naming this canto:

ततः खण्डवदाहाख्यम् तत्रैव मयदर्शनम् ॥

cited above. It is this mention of मयदर्शनम् which led the Calcutta school and the Telugu Translator to treat it as a separate canto. This separate mention of Mayadarsanam, anyhow, points to a consciousness on the part of the author that the title, Khandavadaha, is not so comprehensive as might be argued to be. It is very probable therefore that the battle between Arjuna and Indra did not form a part of the text when the 2nd chapter was settled. The same remark applies to अणीमाण्डव्योपाख्यानम् Animandavyopakhyanam and Yayati's story. We may take it also that the chapters relating to the youth and up-bringing of the princes were largely elaborated. The cantoes of Paushya पौष्य, Pauloma पौलोम, Āstika आस्तीक, Tāpatya तापत्य, Vāsishtha वासिष्ठ and Āurva और्व, are all solar myths, in no way connected with the fortunes of the Bharatas; and no attempt has been or can be made to suggest their relevancy. If they are removed from the text they would never be missed. The first two occupy a unique position of irrelevancy and isolation. The only relevancy of the third is that it is connected with the

Sarpayaga, which in itself has no connection with the Bharata except that we are told that the epic was first published on that occasion.

The under-mentioned topics have been treated by repetition in the text of the first Book.

1. The fortunes of Jāratkaru जरत्कारु, his marriage and the birth of आस्तीक Astika.

2. Astika's good offices to save the serpents and the unfinished end of the सर्पयाग Sarpayaga.

3. The story of परीक्षित Parikshit.

4. Bharata origins and summary of the epic. The spiritual and temporal benefit accruing from a knowledge of the Bharata.

5. The story of the genealogies of पूरु.

6. The story of the birth of Bhishma and some others.

7. The story of Karna's birth and growth.

8. The story of the birth of Draupadi and of her brother.

9. The story of Amba अंबा.

10. The story of the friendship of Drona and Drupada in youth and their reciprocal hostility in after life. [It is almost certain that in these several cases the first and briefer version was the one originally written for the text, and that the repeated and expanded version was dovetailed into it by the compilers of a later age to serve their own ends.]

## CHAPTER VII.

Proceeding to the next topic of the Parva-sangraha, we are introduced to the **सभापर्व** or the second Book.

I should here observe that the sangraha notice of this Book is extremely meagre and it is not possible to know how much of the existing text can be justified by the vague references contained in the sangraha.

It is doubtful whether the dissertation on **राजनीति** or the principles of polity, fathered on Narada and recorded as chapter 5 of this Book, really formed a part of the text when this chapter was settled. There is no reference to it in the sangraha. This is very singular.

It is probable that the Lokapala-sabhakhyana **लोकपालसभाख्यानपर्व**, though it finds mention in the Parva-sangraha, was a late introduction not known to the earlier redactions. It does not find a place in the Preliminary enumeration. It is a treatise standing by itself and can be easily introduced and as easily removed without being noticed. It has no connection with the construction of the Sabha (palace) by Maya, whose adventure is equalled only by that of the genius of the wonderful lamp who built the palace for Aladdin. The Lokapala sabhakhyana Parva does not commence until after the palace built by Maya is established in its place and foundations. Maya's fabric was not designed on the model of the Sabhas of the Lokapalas. The great architect needed no inspiration from such indifferent examples.

The canto is descriptive of the mansions of the deities of the cardinal points. The matter has absolutely

no connection with what follows it as **मन्त्रपर्व**. The latter is about the consultation among the Kaurava princes and the elders as to how the Pandavas, who were discovered at the Draupadi—Swayamvaram, though they had been believed to be dead, should be disposed of.

The cantoes in the text dealing with the Digvijaya **दिग्विजय** of the Pandava brothers and the presents fetched for Yudhisthira by princes and chieftains, from all over the world, have afforded the compilers an opportunity for the free play of an exuberant fancy. The geography of the world (mostly of known Asia) is traversed in brief and, the geography of the subsequent Rajasuya chapters is, in great measure, a repetition of what is found in the Digvijaya canto.

By far the most important canto in this Book is the **यूतपर्व**, not so much because of its consequences as of the hold it has obtained on the popular mind, by the alleged indecent assault on Draupadi. This incident has furnished the theme for operatic performances constantly in request and highly in favour with both sexes of the Hindus. The substance of the story is that there was an attempt to strip Draupadi of her apparel in the public hall where the game with dice was played, and in the presence of all the elders, magnates and Royal personages assembled there; that she cried for help to Krishna, the Avatar, who of course was not there, but was at that moment at Dwaraka; that the divine one heard the plaintive cry and by the exercise of his divine volition prevented all dishonour to her; and the wondering people in the hall found, that, each time

the cloth was being removed from her person, the portion uncovered was being draped again, instantaneously, by a miracle; and that, therefore, the disgraceful attempt to strip her was given up by the assaulter, who was Duryodhana's own brother. Every child, man and woman is familiar with this story.

It is desirable to examine how far the popular version of the story is justified by what we find in the Sanskrit, and how much of the Sanskrit text of this canto can itself be justified in the light of what appears elsewhere in the epic itself.

I shall endeavour to show that, in all probability, the idea, as to the outrage on Draupadi, of the earlier draft of the Bharata, was confined only to her enforced appearance in the public hall, contrary to the customs and manners of the country; that the further outrage of attempting to strip her of her wearing apparel was the invention of a later age; that the appeal to Krishna, the Avatar, and his miraculous intervention, were yet later introductions intended for the glorification of the Avatar.

The Preliminary enumeration furnishes no hint. It is not possible to understand, from the reference in the Parva-sangraha to Draupadi, in connection with the game with dice, whether any and what insult was offered to her. It is difficult to believe that the poet of the earliest draft allowed himself to write the story we now find in the text. It is to this effect. When Yudhishthira staked himself, his brothers and their common wife and lost the bets, Duryodhana sought to assert his dominion over Draupadi; for, by the result of

the game, she became, as it were, his slave. He was entitled to command her services and her husbands had no veto. He ordered that she should be brought up to the assembly to be told of the events that transpired and to be passed on to his harem. All this is intelligible, but the sequel is not so. She declined to appear. She was dragged into the hall by force and, in the presence of all, (there were ladies of Duryodhana's palace also there), Duryodhana's brother laid hold of her garment and attempted to strip her of her apparel.

Assuming the legality of Duryodhana's mastery over her person, which seems to have been tacitly conceded by her husbands, he might claim to treat her as he treated other slave women in the palace. They were not brought out in public and stripped in the presence of the full Court or at all. Such a proceeding was never heard of. No society was ever so depraved; and, judging from the description we have of the civilization of the period, it is impossible to allow that such an idea, which is an outrage on ordinary decency, should have been conceived or tolerated. We are not told of any protest except what was voiced in the convulsive cries of the outraged princess and the whole assembly looked on mute and powerless. Was that human? Was that probable? She was saved, no doubt; but nobody expected that she would be when the start was made. She was saved by a miracle, by divine intercession, not by the good sense of the assaulter, or the good offices of the assembly. So far as Duryodhana and his brother were concerned, the outrage was complete; for, the apparel removed was enough to start a draper on a prosperous business.

The reference in the Parva-sangraha to Draupadi's connection with the Dyuta incident is in these terms:

यत्र धर्मसुतम् द्यूते शकुनिः कितवोजयत् ।

यत्र द्यूतार्णवे मग्नाम् द्रौपदीम् नौ रिवाण्वात् ॥

धृतराष्ट्रो महाप्राज्ञः स्नुषाम् परमदुःखिताम् ।

तारयामास तांस्तीर्णान् ज्ञात्वा दुर्योधनो नृपः ॥

पुनरेव ततो द्यूते समाह्वयत पाण्डवान्—

“Yudhisthira was defeated at the game with dice by Sakuni, the (expert) gambler; and Dhritarashtra, the wise one, like a life-boat, rescued his daughter-in-law, who was sorely grieved and who was drowned in the ocean of the game. Duryodhana, knowing that they were so rescued, challenged the Pandus to repeat the game.” It is clear from the above that there is absolutely no reference to any outrage on the person of Draupadi. No indication of any violence offered to her or of her being subjected to any humiliating experience.

There are two expressions in the above passage, which are capable of misconstruction. One is ‘that Draupadi was drowned in the ocean of the game;’ the other is ‘that she was rescued.’

We must understand these expressions aright before we can proceed further. The drowning fatality was the result of the game. When Draupadi was told that Yudhisthira lost all that he had in the world, lost himself and his brothers and her also, positively or constructively, she was sorely grieved and drowned in the ocean (of the Dyuta). The loss of the Kingdom,

riches or worldly goods, was nothing. Her husbands had become the slaves of Duryodhana and she with them. That was the tidal wave that submerged her.

She appealed to the blind old King who was in the assembly. He rose to the occasion, for he was a ‘wise one’. He probably feared a civil commotion. The world might accuse him of participation in the nefarious attempts of his son. He would pour oil over troubled waters. He granted, out of regard for Draupadi’s virtue, as he was pleased to put it, their all to the Pandus, all that they had lost at the game—their personal freedom and that of Draupadi. This was how by his favour (the life-boat) he rescued the drowning ones. This is the import of the passage as we gather from the incidents in the text in its proper place.

The metaphor about Draupadi being drowned had no reference to the ill-usage to which she herself was subjected. As soon as she was dragged into the hall, one part of the insult was completed. She protested against the iniquity of the proceeding. There was no response. Her husbands were tongue-tied. The elders did not speak. She raised a nice question of law; she claimed that she was not correctly wagered or lost. She appealed to the elders to adjudicate on the legality of Duryodhana’s claim touching herself. Bhishma, the patriarch, who presided, confessed his inability to decide it. The old King, who sat by, did not open his lips. The question was left undecided.

When the attempt to strip her was started she raised an uproar. She cried and wailed. She appealed to one and all there. She conjured them by their

faith, by their humanity, as elders, fathers and sons. She taxed them with want of manliness—with want of honour, with want of knightly regard. All that went for nothing. It was a cry in the wilderness. Dhritarashtra did not intervene and nobody prevented the outrage. Every one but the blind old King looked on. It is clear, therefore, that the old King did not come to the rescue with his life-boat. The outrage, with the moral delinquency on the one part and the disgrace on the other, was complete. If the actual result contemplated was not brought about, it was not the fault of the assaulter. It was due to a physical impossibility; for, the garments recurred as fast as they were removed.

The intercession of Dhritrashtra was called into play to restore to the Pandus all that they had lost.

The phrase तांस्तीर्णान् ज्ञात्वा has reference to the Pandavas, not Draupadi, having been reinstated in their places, with everything restored to them. That this is so, is made clear also by a reference to the humiliating and disastrous result (to the Pandus) of the game, and their being saved by the good sense of Draupadi, in chap. 292 of the 3rd Book (see Calcutta edition).

Yudishthira says द्यूते दुरात्माभिः क्लृष्टा कृष्णया तारिता वयम् “We were ground down at the Dyuta by the wicked ones and saved by Draupadi.” We may therefore take it that the Parva-sangraha makes no reference to the alleged outrage on the modesty and decency of Draupadi.

To help the further discussion of this matter, we

may refer to the text itself in two or three places, as throwing considerable light.

We find in the third Book. C. 12. that, soon after the Pandavas entered the forest, Krishna, the Avatar, paid them a visit to condole with them on their misfortunes. On that occasion, Draupadi delivered herself of a jeremiad addressed to him, in the course of which she gave a catalogue of all the misdeeds of Duryodhana, starting with his youthful attempts on the life of Bhimasena, of which she could only have had a hearsay knowledge, and closing with the Dyuta scene. With respect to the last, the only iniquity reported by her was that she was dragged into the public hall and that Duryodhana claimed to treat her as his slave.

In the course of the sympathetic comfort administered by Krishna to Draupadi on this occasion, he excused himself on the ground that he was quite ignorant of what was on foot and what all had transpired because of his absence on a military campaign of ten month's duration against the Salwa prince. Says he:—‘If I had been at home, at Dwaraka, I should not have waited for an invitation from the Kauravas to go over there. I should have averted the Dyutam by reasoning with them. If my persuasions failed, I should have used force to make them desist. I knew nothing of what transpired there. Directly after my return home, I came to know of the unfortunate events as they happened, and, out of love for you all and the grief caused to me, I hastened hither.’

It is clear, therefore, that Krishna did not know of the events in proper time. He was not available to

render help. It was not his hand or volition that restrained the hand of the reprobate Dussasana or rendered his efforts ineffectual.

Drowning men catch at straws. A friend to whom the writer put this matter suggested that Draupadi did not tell Krishna in this talk of the attempt to strip her of her apparel, as it was indelicate for her to mention it. Let us examine this defence. Krishna was perhaps their only true friend. Draupadi always treated him as a brother—a feeling which was amply reciprocated. She always confided in him. All that she should have to say was that an attempt was made. It was patent that the attempt was not successful; what was wrong in stating so?

The outrage was committed in the presence of persons so placed and so connected that a greater disgrace could not be conceived. They were persons in whose presence she had never before appeared and could not, except under grave necessity, appear, even veiled. What then was the delicacy or modesty about mentioning it to one who was so near and dear to her; and whom, thinking he was indifferent to her weal and woe, she accused of cowardice in this very speech. The design and intendment of her speech was to exasperate him as against the Kauravas. What was the difficulty in telling him the whole truth?

In this very speech, we have an excellent display of her modesty, good breeding and delicacy.

She tells Krishna (and her husbands were present with her), with a freedom on which the author cannot be complimented, that, at the time when she was

dragged into the hall, she was in her monthly course that her cloth was stained with.....and that she had no veiling garment. She tells him further, (why and wherefore is not very clear), that such and such of her sons was born to such and such of her husbands. O Tempora! O Mores! That this lady should have felt any delicacy about telling Krishna what a thousand people, mostly strangers, had witnessed!

There is another consideration which settles the matter conclusively. If the story, as we now find it in the text, with the incidents about the appeal of Draupadi to the Avatar and her miraculous deliverance by his grace, was the work of the first poet, he should certainly have followed it up by an appropriate render of thanks-giving from Draupadi to Krishna, at the interview recorded in this chapter.

The princess made the appeal. She knew she had made it. She also knew that the god-man responded and, by interposing his miracle, saved her from utter disgrace. She owed it to herself, more than she owed it to him, to offer thanks to her divine brother. The situation having been such, is it explicable that, where thanks were due, she should be giving abuses; or that she should attribute to her saviour cold-blooded indifference and pusillanimity? Is it conceivable that an Epic poet should treat his theme with such a disregard of ordinary propriety.

Let us refer to another chapter, 81, Dravida text, (C. 81 of the Clacutta text) in the 5th Book or Udyogaparva. Here again there is a reference by Draupadi (and spoken to Krishna) to the indignity to which she was



subjected at the Dyutam. There is no mention of the attempt to strip her. The indignity is confined only to her being dragged into the hall.

Let me refer the reader to chapter 29, *Dravida*, (28 Calcutta) of the same Book. It is in the portion dealing with Sanjaya's mission of peace, previous to the war. He counsels the Pandavas to observe moderation, forgiveness and patience. Krishna replies on their behalf, and upbraids Sanjaya and the elders at the capital as being false to themselves and false to the Pandavas. He refers to the gambling scene and the indignity to which Draupadi was subjected. This, in his words, is, however, confined to her being brought into the full Court, forcibly. As Krishna was inveighing against the iniquities of the Crown-prince, the most natural and pointed reference should have been to the further outrage on her person. But there is not a word about it. In Chapter 72 (Calcutta & *Dravida*) of the same (5th) Book, we find Krishna referring, again, in a conversation with Yudhishtira, to the incident of the assault on Draupadi. This, in his speech, is again confined only to her being brought into the hall. In chapter 80 of the 2nd Book, Calcutta, (C.103. *Dravida*), there is a conversation, something by way of an aside, between Dhritarashtra and Sanjaya, in which each of the interlocutors speaks of the ill-treatment of Draupadi at the Dyuta, which, to their knowledge, was confined only to her being forced into the presence. There is no mention of Dussasana, or the part played by him, of the stripping, or of the miracle. A reference to the incidents, if true, was however needed. Sanjaya was the counsellor of the old King and

always gave wholesome and righteous advice. In this particular passage he was foreboding evil to the sons of the King, telling him that the avenging hand would come down heavily on them and that the Pandavas had the countenance of a well-meaning providence. A very decisive proof of this would have been the miracle by which the honour of Draupadi was saved. Sanjaya should certainly have drawn a moral from it for the benefit of the hypocritical old King.

In chapter 49 of the 3rd Book, Calcutta, (46 *Dravida*) a dialogue is reported between the same two personages, making allusion to Draupadi's humiliation at the Dyutam. The reference herein is also as before only to her being forced to appear in the hall and to nothing more.

It is therefore apparent that the stripping incident was a later invention. Considerable light is thrown on this matter by the Telugu text. In the proper place, in rendering this particular scene, we do not find in the Telugu any mention of an appeal by Draupadi to Krishna of Dwaraka or his divine intercession. The only incidents recorded are that there was an attempt to remove her apparel and that the attempt failed. We are left to infer that this marvellous result was due to her own inviolate purity. If the text which the translator used was the same as that we now possess, it is impossible that he should have misread the text or mistranslated it. Why should he suppress the prayer to Krishna or the miracle interposed by him?

There was no propriety in doing it and no motive can be suggested for such a proceeding.

The way in which this scene was manipulated and the variations existing in the several texts make it certain that the hand of the interloper was at work.

In the text of the Dravida copy, this is what we find:—

१. ततो दुःशासनो राजन् द्रौपद्या वसनम् बलात्
२. सभामध्ये समाक्षिप्य व्यपाक्रष्टुम् प्रचक्रमे
३. 'आकृष्यमाणे वसने विललाप सुदुःखिता
४. ज्ञातम् मया वसिष्ठेन पुरा गीतम् महात्मना
५. महत्यापदि संप्राप्ते स्मर्तव्यो भगवान् हरिः
६. इति निश्चित्य मनसा शरणागतवत्सलम्
७. आकृष्यमाणे वसने द्रौपदी कृष्णमस्मरत्
८. शङ्खचक्रगदापाणे द्वारकानिलयाच्युत
९. गोविन्द पुण्डरीकाक्ष रक्ष माम् शरणागताम्
१०. हा कृष्ण द्वारकावासिन् कासि यादवनन्दन
११. इमामवस्थां संप्राप्ताम् अनाथां किमुपेक्षसे
१२. गोविन्द द्वारकावासिन् कृष्ण गोपीजनप्रिय
१३. कौरवैः परिभूतां माम् किं न जानासि केशवे
१४. हेनाथ हे रमानाथ व्रजनाथार्तिनाशन
१५. कौरवार्णवमग्नां मा मुद्धरस्व जनार्दन
१६. कृष्ण कृष्ण महायोगिन विश्वात्मन् विश्वभावन
१७. प्रपन्नम् पाहि गोविन्द कुरुमध्ये ऽवसीदतीं
१८. इत्यनुस्मृत्य कृष्णम् सा हरिं त्रिभुवनेश्वरम्
१९. प्रारुदत् दुःखिता राजन् मुखमाच्छाद्य भामिनी

२०. तस्यप्रसादात् द्रौपद्याः कृष्यमाणेम्बरे तदा
२१. तद्रूप मपरम् वस्त्रम् प्रादुरासीदनेकशः

Let us turn to the Calcutta text: C. 67-It runs Book II

thus:—

१. ततो दुःशासनो राजन् द्रौपद्या वसनम् बलात्
२. सभामध्ये समाक्षिप्य व्यपाक्रष्टुम् प्रचक्रमे
३. आकृष्यमाणे वसने द्रौपद्या चिन्तितो हरिः
४. गोविन्द द्वारकावासिन् कृष्ण गोपीजनप्रिय
५. कौरवैः परिभूतां माम् किं न जानासि केशव
६. हेनाथ हे रमानाथ व्रजनाथार्तिनाशन
७. कौरवार्णवमग्नां मा मुद्धरस्व जनार्दन
८. कृष्ण कृष्ण महायोगिन् विश्वात्मन् विश्वभावन
९. प्रपन्नम् पाहि गोविन्द कुरुमध्ये ऽवसीदतीं
१०. इत्यनुस्मृत्य कृष्णम् सा हरिं त्रिभुवनेश्वरम्
११. प्रारुदत् दुःखिता राजन् मुखमाच्छाद्य भामिनी
१२. याज्ञसेन्या वचः श्रुत्वा कृष्णो गह्वरितोभवत्
१३. त्यक्त्वा शय्यासनम् पद्माम् कृपालुः कृपयाभ्यगात्
१४. कृष्णं च विष्णुं च नरम् हरिं च त्राणाय विक्रोशति याज्ञसेनी
१५. ततस्तु धर्मोन्तरितो महात्मा समावृणोद्वै विविधैः सुवस्त्रैः
१६. आकृष्यमाणे वसने द्रौपद्यास्तु विशास्यते
१७. तद्रूप मपरम् वस्त्रम् प्रादुरासीदनेकशः

The extent of the divergence between the two readings may now be seen. In the Dravida text line 3 to 13 above are marked as doubtful; and rightly so for, at least lines 3-11, are not to be found elsewhere.

We likewise find in the Calcutta text that the lines numbered 12 to 16 are of doubtful authority. They are not found in the Dravida text. The 14th line of the Calcutta copy is a repetition from another context.

In both the copies it is clear that the appeal was to Krishna of Dwaraka. In the Dravida copy, it was a silent paryer, *i.e.* it was purely mental. In the Calcutta copy it is not clear whether that was so.

The Calcutta copy adds (see lines 12 and 13 above) that Krishna was at the time in bed with his divine consort, presumably, at Dwaraka. On taking note of the hour when the game was played, we find that the morning had considerably advanced; and, as it was not desirable to represent the Avatar as being in bed so late after sunrise, the Rhapsodists seem to have varied the occupation of the Avatar to a game at dice with his consort; and this is how it is represented to this day and is current in popular belief.

The Dravida text says, in line 20 above, तस्यप्रसादात्, *i.e.* by the grace of Krishna, Draupadies honour was saved by the multiplicity of cloths which covered her person.

The Calcutta text does not make this clear. There seems to be some lacuna. Perhaps some line lost. What we do find there is: "That it was Dharma (eternal right, justice, truth) that clothed her"

Let us read the Telugu text.

సీ. ఇది నీదు గాదని మది విచారింపక

సద్భక్తి సేతుండు దుశ్శాసనుండు

నట్లున ప్రాసది గట్టిస పట్టుంబు

సభలోన నొప్పు నాశంక లేక

యుడుగక యొలువంగబడియు మున్న పసిత

మైన యవ్వస్త్రంబునట్టివలువ

లలితాంగి జఘనమండలమునబాయక

యొప్పుచునున్న, నయ్యువిదజూచి

గీ. సభ్యులెల్ల నుదితనమ్మదులైరి, దు

శ్శాసనుండు వస్త్రచయము పర్వ

తోపమానమైన, నొలువంగ నోపక

యడిగె లజ్జ బొంది యుక్కుదక్కి.

"That reprobate Dussasana, not caring to reflect that it was not proper so to do, pulled out the grament from the person of Draupadi, in the midst of that assembly. But there was no end to his labour, for similar garments repeated themselves on her body one after another as fast as each was being removed. The persons in the assembly were agreeably surprised and Dussasana after piling up the cloths to the height of a hill, desisted from utter shame and inability."

Is is apparent from the above that the text translated by the Telugu author knew nothing of Draupadi's appeal to Krishna or of his intercession. The inference is clear that the passage referring to the same is an interpolation of a period later even than that of the Telugu poet.

According to the direction of Duryodhana they all had to be stripped—the Pandavas, men and wife. As soon as they heard him speak this command, the Pandava brothers put down their upper garments. This was all that was wanted and expected. They were not molested afterwards in the matter of their apparel. They were not stripped bare. Why should

that dishonour have been reserved for Draupadi, in particular. It is not possible to believe that such a thing was contemplated in her case, when it was not thought of in connection with her husbands. It is highly probable that, when the idea of stripping was first introduced, it did not go to the full extent of what is found in the text now. The reader is probably aware that, in Northern India, the practice has been, for respectable Hindu women of the better classes, and as regards all women of some classes, never to go out without an outer cloth covering the dress of the lady. It was with the Hindu ladies as it was with the matrons of ancient Rome. It was not decent for a lady to let one see her ankles when she went out. Both were habited and covered alike when they passed in the streets. This outer cloth is a sheet or mantle, coarse or fine, according to the means of the wearer, worn closely over the head and the whole body, so as to cover entirely the apparel in which the lady is dressed. It is called 'Chādar' (Persian), Chaddar (Hindustani). It is the garment named in Sanskrit, अवगुण्ठनम्. In the Hindustani language 'Chādar Utārna', (Aurat ke Sar Se Chādar Utārna), means primarily 'to take off a woman's veil,' and ordinarily, 'to insult or disgrace a woman.' For a man to remove this veil is a very serious form of outraging the modesty of a woman and might lead to bloodshed.

It is very probable that the earliest form of the interpolation suggested no more than that this Chādar or veiling mantle of Draupadi was pulled out. Not that this was permissible; for, it was undoubtedly a serious form of outraging her modesty and decency.

The secret of the justification\* for such a proceeding was that, if she had legally been reduced to the condition of a slave and had lost her status as a free-born lady, she had no right to wear a veil.

An ancient customary practice of South Malabar, which has survived into our times, may be instanced as closely in point. The Nambudries are high caste Brahmins and mostly rich landed proprietors. Their women observe gosha.

When they have to move out of the houses, they go, as gosha ladies elsewhere do, in closed conveyances. If the lady has to walk her way, she carries in her hands an umbrella or sun-shade made from palm leaves. This umbrella is always so held in position as to occult the upper portion of the body from the gaze of persons who may be going about.

When a woman of this class is accused of misconduct, the elders of the caste meet in assembly to hold an investigation. The woman is summoned to appear and answer to the charges preferred against her. She attends, and, during the course of the investigation, she is protected from public gaze by the umbrella in her hands. The judges pronounce their verdict. If it is against her, a low-caste man proceeds close to the woman and strikes the umbrella out of her hands. This means that she ceases to be a (freeborn) lady and that she is put out of the caste. She is free to go where she chooses, thereafter, but without the umbrella.

That the original idea was confined to the Chādar or veil is sufficiently clear from the pointed reference

to the princess having been एकवस्त्रा when she was dragged out of her apartments. The word means 'attired in a single cloth' that is to say, that the Chādar or veil was not worn. A woman in the condition of a रजस्वला does not go out and does not wear the veil.

Accordingly, when the idea of रजस्वला was introduced the veil had to be dropped and the lady represented as एकवस्त्रा. The Bharata was written in days when slavery was in vogue; and the interpolator and his readers would easily have understood the situation and appreciated the point. In later ages, the thirst for novelty and sensation appears to have suggested the developments we now meet with in the text.

The word आकृत्यमाणे affords a clue. In several places it is found that, when an interpolation of matter is started, the initial verse or line of the paragraph or chapter is retained, with or without some change as required; and, when the interpolation is passed and the original text is resumed, the initial verse or line or phrase, which headed the chapter or paragraph in the original draft, is repeated, with or without change as may be expedient. Where new matter is smuggled into a chapter, the reader is mostly kept off the scent by the verses at the head and at the close of the chapter being faithfully retained. The writer was several times misled by situations like these. In the present context we find that the interpolation begins with the line आकृत्यमाणेवसने line 3, above, in the Calcutta copy. This line is again repeated as line 16 of the Calcutta text and, in a form of paraphrase, as line 20 of the Dravida copy.

It is very probable that all that the original draft contained in this connection was the verses that now stand as lines 16 and 17 'et seq', in the Calcutta copy.

The reader has been told above that, in the text as now handed down, the outrage on the modesty of Draupadi was two-fold. The first trespass was that she was dragged by force into the public hall. Dussasana went up to her apartments to tell her that her attendance at the hall was ordered. He was so rude that she attempted to run away. He gave chase, laid hold of her by her dishevelled hair and dragged her all the way to the hall, where he removed his hold.

The second and undoubtedly more aggravating trespass was the attempt to strip her.

In the case of the first wrong, there is reason to believe that the idea was a later invention; that, according to the first draft, the lady appeared in the hall without any force used to her, though much against her will. A reference to the text will make this clear.

The bets were lost and won and the game completed in chapter 64 (Calcutta text). In chapter 65 the first verse runs thus: (Duryodhana to Vidura):

एहि क्षत्तः द्रौपदीमानयस्व त्रियां भार्या सम्मतां पाण्डवानाम्  
सम्मार्जताम् वेश्म परैतु शीघ्रं तत्रास्तु दासीभिरपुण्यशीला.

This was spoken by Duryodhana to Vidura and is to this effect.

"O Vidura, please go and fetch Draupadi, the dear and beloved wife of the Pandavas. Let her come up soon and attend to the sweeping of the house-floor: and

let her take up her quarters with the slaves—this woman of unrighteous conduct.” This speech, so ill-timed, so ill-merited, and so insolent, provoked a severe reprimand from Vidura.

Duryodhana then turned towards an usher प्रातिकामी Pratikami, and said, chapter 66, (Calcutta edition)

त्वम् प्रातिकामिन् द्रौपदीमानयस्व  
न ते भयम् विद्यते पाण्डवेभ्यः.

‘Pratikamin, will you go and bring up Draupadi here. You at least have nothing to fear from the Pandavas.’

Pratikami went to where Draupadi was *i.e.* in the apartments in the palace, and said to her.

युधिष्ठिरो द्यूतमदेन मत्तः  
दुर्योधनो द्रौपदि त्वामजैषीत्  
सा त्वम् प्रपद्यस्व धृतराष्ट्रस्य वेश्म  
नयामि त्वाम् कर्मणे याज्ञसेनि.

‘Lady. Yudhishtira, in the intoxication of the game, staked and lost you among the bets. Duryodhana won you. So please go with me *to the dwellings of Dhritarashtra*, as I have got to assign work for you.’ Draupadi then asked him. “How did all this come about. Have you ever heard of a Kshatriya prince staking his wife like this. Why, had the King nothing else to offer for a bet?”

Pratikamin. “Indeed, lady, he had nothing else. After he lost everything, he staked himself and last of all he staked you.”

Draupadi. “Please go back. Question the gambler (Yudhishtira) from me. ‘Did you lose yourself first and me next?’ Let me have his reply and, when I know what it is, I shall go with you....” (no mention of the सभा.) Pratikami went back and, in the great hall, he put to Yudhishtira, in the presence of all, the question propounded by Draupadi. The prince was mute and looked lifeless. Then Duryodhana interposed and said:— ‘Let Draupadi come over here (into the hall) and speak the question herself, and let all these present here listen to her question and his (Yudhishtira’s) answer.’

Pratikami went back to Draupadi, bound in duty as he was, and said, ‘Princess, the big men in the hall want you there; verily, the end of the Kaurava race is come....’

Draupadi rejoined.

....‘Go back and ask the big men in the hall. Let them answer the question already put by me. Let them give a reply, those men of justice and rectitude; I shall take order with myself accordingly’-Pratikami then went into the great hall and reported what all Draupadi said to him. They all hung their heads down in silence feeling themselves under constraint from Duryodhana.

(The reader will mark what follows with attention).

‘Yudhishtira, recognising how Duryodhana was minded, sent up to Draupadi a trusted messenger.’

The man went at once to Draupadi’s apartments, and gave her to understand how Yudhishtira made up his mind (evidently that she should obey). *Weeping, the princess went, attired, as she then was, with only one*

cloth, in her condition of catamenia, and entering the hall stood before her father-in-law (Dhritarashtra). The afflicted Pandavās cast down their heads as they had not the courage to look her in the face.'

This paragraph makes it abundantly clear that no physical force or violence was used to her to cause her to appear in the hall. Nor was she taken there by an agent of Duryodhana. It was feared that the vile Duryodhana might have recourse to extreme measures. It was sought to avoid the disgrace of such a proceeding. No help was forthcoming from the elders assembled there. And, as matters stood, there was no good in resisting the mandate of the aggressor. Yudhishthira feared that the princess was not impressed with the gravity of the situation. Therefore he sent word to say that she should obey and she did.

This then is nearer the probable form of the story of an earlier draft.

But this important passage has been tampered with on design by Bharata specialists and badly copied by the scribes.

It is desirable to let the reader know how the text stands and how it ought to.

The text reads in the Calcutta copy as also in the Madras one, as follows :—

1. युधिष्ठिरस्तु तच्छ्रुत्वा दुर्योधनाचिकीर्षितम् ।  
द्रौपद्या स्सम्ममत् दूतम् ग्राहिणोत् भरतर्षभ ॥
2. एकवस्त्रात्वधोनिवी रोदमाना रजस्वला ।  
सभामागम्य पाञ्चाली श्वशुरस्याग्रतो भव ॥

3. स गत्वा त्वरितम् दूतः कृष्णाया भवनम् नृप ।  
न्यवेदयन् मतम् धीमान् धर्मराजस्य निश्चितम् ॥
4. पाण्डवाश्च महात्मनो दीना दुःखसमन्विताः ।  
सत्येनातिपरीतांगा नोदीक्षन्ते स्म किञ्चन ॥

How the text stands in the Dravida and Bombay copies:—

1. as above.
2. 1st line as above.  
सभामागम्य पाञ्चालि । etc. (2nd line)
- 3a. additional verse.  
अथ त्वामागतां दृष्ट्वा राजपुत्रीं सभां तदा ।  
सभ्याः सर्वे विनिन्देरन् मनोभिर्धृतराष्ट्रजम् ॥

3. No 3 as above.
4. No 4 as above.

How the text ought to stand.

1. Repeat the first verse as it stands.
2. Here enter the 3rd verse.
3. Here enter the 2nd verse with त् after the last letter.
4. Repeat the 4th verse here.  
1. The 1st verse in the Calcutta copy, which is also the first in all the copies, says that Yudhishthira sent a man to Draupadi.  
2. The second verse as it stands in the Calcutta text is incorrect, for the word पाञ्चाली has to agree as subject with the predicate भव which it cannot do.

पाञ्चाली (Draupadi) is of the third person in the nominative case; and भव is the imperative form of the verb and relates to the second person. The agreement is not permissible in Sanskrit. If the word पाञ्चाली is to be brought into accord with the imperative भव, the nominative case should be changed into the vocative, which is obtained by shortening the terminal ई long into इ short. And this was done in the द्राविड and Bombay copies. But if पाञ्चाली is to be retained, the verb भव requires to be changed into अभवत्, a tense of the verb answering to the present perfect or imperfect. This would involve only the addition of त् after भव for the अ would elide by Sandhi rules.

This is the correct reading as I claim, but it is not found in the texts. Let us proceed.

The 2nd verse as found in the Dravida copy purports to be the substance of the message sought to be conveyed to Draupadi, though the connecting link is wanting.

Let us examine it on the footing of its being Yudhishtira's speech in the direct form. He tells her, 'Come over to the hall, attired in a single cloth fastened below the navel, *in the monthly course*, weeping, and stand before your father-in-law.'

This was a very odd message and cannot be understood unless Yudhishtira wished that Draupadi should dissemble which is not probable. The directions may be easily carried out in part; but, as to the italicised portion, neither he nor she could have caused that physi-

cal condition to supervene by reason of his suggestion or her volition. How came he to know of it if true?

The additional verse, 3 a, is found only in the Dravida and Bombay copies. It purports to be the continuation of Yudhishtira's message to this effect:—

'And then all those assembled here in the hall, seeing you a royal princess go here, will curse in their minds the son of Dhritarashtra.'

This was indeed a very doubtful advantage to be secured. What was the good of their cursing Duryodhana *in their minds*, if they were not prepared to give expression to their censure?

What Duryodhana wanted would be achieved, if his desire was to insist on the presence of the lady in the midst of the assembly, and thereby to humiliate the Pandavas excessively and to insult the princess. All this would be achieved whether or not the elders in the assembly cursed Duryodhana in their minds, which if they did, no body could be the better or the wiser for it; nor would it make the humiliation of the Pandavas or the disgrace to the lady the less in any way.

When Pratikami went up to her, he should have understood by her dress if she was रजस्वला and, if he did not, the second time he went to her, she should have let him know that she could not leave her apartments by reason of her illness.

Ordinary instinct would have suggested it to her. But she was prepared to go, if a reply was received to her question, and Pratikami was told to so report. This is very odd. Did this change in her condition



supervene in the interval between the second departure of Pratikami from the lady's chambers and the appearance of Yudhishtira's messenger thereat? It is difficult to restrain the idea that the suggestion about the रजस्वला was a later development. But the message was conveyed to her. Did she obey? No. Why? There is no explanation:—

The more probable form of the story was that she did go after she received the direction from her husband. Verse 4 has to be regarded with attention. It makes good sense only when we understand that Draupadi was come to the hall and her husbands cast their heads down as they could not muster courage to look her in the face. It is unmeaning, otherwise, as there was no particular reason just then for their casting their heads down. This was said of the Pandavas in the plural. The context was that the question of Draupadi was put to the assembly and to Yudhishtira in particular, and remained unanswered. Yudhishtira might perhaps hang his head down, but why should all the other Pandavas do so? The question raised by Draupadi came like a gleam of light in the midst of prevailing darkness. It was calculated to raise their hopes. It suggested a way out of the difficulty. They would naturally look up to those in the hall, watching the expression of their faces and the movements of their lips.

When I read the passage in the Calcutta text, it occurred to me that in the 2nd verse the terminal र् of अमयान् was lost by the printer's error, and that the passage was incorrectly transcribed in this particular that

the 3rd verse ought to appear as the 2nd and the 2nd as the 3rd. When, however, I compared the paragraph in the Calcutta copy with the corresponding lines in the Dravida chapter and found the additional verse in the latter, I formed the idea that the hand of the redactor was in evidence, and that the text was tampered with on design to make it appear that Draupadi did not, at that point of the story, go to the great hall. It occurred to me to appeal to the Telugu text for help. I did so and I was agreeably surprised to find that the Telugu proved my surmise to be correct. It would be sufficient to cite this passage.

వ. ప్రతిగామికి దుర్యోధనుండిట్లనియె.

క॥ సందిగ్ధమైన యర్థము !

నిందరు నెఱుగంగ నడిగి యింతయు నెఱుగ

స్పందరి పాంచాలేంద్రును ।

తందోడ్కొనిరమ్ము పొమ్ము తడయక యనినన్ ।

వ. వాడును [ప్రతిగామి] ద్రౌపదిపాలికింబోయి, చేపి ! నీయడిగిన యర్థము నిర్ణయించువారై సభ్యులు నిన్ను రాబంచిరి రమ్మనిన, దుర్యోధను దుర్వ్యవసాయంబున ధర్మరాజుసమ్మతంబునకు నలిగి, యక్కోమలి ప్రతిగామిపిఱుండన, యేకవస్త్రయు సభోముఖయు నవిరళగళితనయసజలబంధుసందోహనివ్యందమానవీనస్తపరిధానాంతయునగుచు, సభకుజనుడెంచి కురువృద్ధసమీపంబున నున్నంత, ద్రౌపదింజూడ నోపకలజ్జితలయి దుఃఖాకులితమనస్కులయి తలలు వాంచియున్న పాండవుల వైలక్ష్యంబుపలక్షించి సంతోషించి దుర్యోధనుండు.

(a) 'Thereupon Duryodhana said to Pratikami:—

(b) 'Go back and bring Draupadi here without

delay, so that she might clear her doubts by putting her question in the presence of all and receive an answer.'

(c) 'He, Pratikami, went up to Draupadi and said to her. 'Lady, the elders assembled would resolve your question and wish you to be present there. Be pleased to go with me.'

"The lady was much put out by the acquiescence of Yudhishtira in the mischievous design of Duryodhana; and, attired in a single cloth, hanging her head down, she proceeded to the hall, in the wake of Pratikami who led the way, shedding tears in profusion, and stood before Dhritarashtra (or the Kaurava elder or elders). The Pandavas, not able to look at Draupadi, ashamed, hung their heads down. Duryodhana noticed their distress, and exulted".

It is clear that there was no doubt or difficulty about the interpretation of this passage, in the mind of the Telugu translator, and there need be none in the mind of the reader. The Telugu translator must have had before him a part of the text of this passage as it ought to be and not as we find it now to be. It should be noted that the Telugu translator does not know of the trusted messenger of Yudhishtira.

If the passage stood, as we read it now in the Dravida copy, it was not possible for the rendering to have assumed the form given above.

That Draupadi proceeded to the hall, without being dragged there, is placed beyond doubt. That the Telugu says that Pratikami led the way for her

should be borne in mind, as it has an important bearing on what will follow hereafter.

That, on reaching the hall, she stood before the elders and Dhritarashtra, as was only proper and natural, is clear. If the Pandavas dared not look up, it was because of the situation created by her presence there, and they had not the courage to meet her looks. The Sanskrit text does not say that they hung their heads down because of their want of courage to look at her, but the Telugu makes it expressly clear. The Sanskrit says that the Pandavas hung their heads down for very shame and grief; and, to make sense in the context, it is apparent that this was due to what we find stated in the Telugu. There is one more fact to be noted in the Telugu rendering, a fact which is of superlative importance.

The Telugu does not say that, when the lady passed into the hall under the escort of Pratikami, she was **रजस्वला**. If she was in that condition it was impossible that she should have appeared there, unless actually dragged there *or that she should have stood where she did*. The first poet would never have allowed himself to be betrayed into such nonsense. It should be noted that the spot where she stood was chosen by herself.

Another point. The Telugu translator's rendering shows that, in place of the word **अघोनीवी** which we now find in the text after the word **एकवस्त्रा**, his copy showed **अधोमुखी**. The change and the reason for the same is equally apparent. **अधोमुखी** means 'with downcast looks'.

But the Bharata specialists, when they revised this passage, changed it into अधोनीवी to suggest the condition of a रजस्वला, which idea they tacked on at the end of that line. The meaning of अधोनीवी is not clear but it suggests a special form of attire.

Let us study the further progress of events. Immediately following the paragraph set out above, we have an account entirely contradictory of what has been stated already.

(Contradictions of this kind are not few or infrequent in this huge work. At the present day, it certainly appears to us that a considerable degree of audacity was needed to enable a compiler to piece together passages like these, and to place them side by side. One thing is apparent that the two paragraphs were not the work of the same author or of the same period.)

First passage:—The Suta went back to the hall and reported what Draupadi had said to him. (That she would abide by the decision of the elders in the solution of her question and govern herself accordingly.) But the elders made no reply, because they felt themselves under a constraint from Duryodhana.

Then Yudhishtira sent up a messenger to Draupadi, asking her to obey and go over to the great hall.

*She did so and stood before the elders. The Pandavas dared not look up.*

Second passage. Then Duryodhana looked at their faces and exulted. He said to Pratikami "Bring over Draupadi here. Let the Kaurava elders speak in her

presence." Then Pratikami was in duty bound to obey. But he also feared the anger of Draupadi. He pocketed his shame and again addressed the elders. Please, sirs, what answer shall I convey to Draupadi?"

Then spoke Duryodhana:—"O Dussasana, this, my usher, Pratikami, is in great fright from Bhimasena. Go you there, lay hold of Draupadi and bring her here. What can the helpless Pandavas do?"

The Prince (Dussasana) thereupon got up, having heard what his brother said. . . He entered the dwelling of those great warriors (The Pandavas) and spoke thus to the princess Draupadi."

"(Come away, come away Draupadi! You have been won. Cast off your bashfulness. Look up to Duryodhana. Make yourself agreeable to the Kurus. You have been fairly won as a prize. Come over to the सभा, the great hall."

'Then she got up weeping and wailing.....the princess ran towards where the ladies of Dhritarashtra's family should be (in the palace apartments).

'Then Dussasana gave chase and laid hold of her by her flowing tresses.'

'He then dragged her by the head and brought her up to the hall.'

"While being dragged she told him in a low tone that she was ill रजस्वला, and that she was dressed in only a single cloth, and asked him how he dared to take her in that condition to the hall. He said to her, I don't mind. It matters not whether you are dressed or nude. You are won at the game with dice. You are a slave

and your proper place is, among slaves. Then spoke Draupadi, slowly."

What follows is a severe castigation dealt all round by Draupadi to the elders, generally and by name. Then Bhishma felt that he was called upon to speak. He made apologies for his inability to answer her question as there was much that could be said for and against the position that she was lawful prize.

There cannot be any reasonable doubt from the above, that, when Dussasana started out, *Draupadi was not in the hall. He proceeded to her apartments where she was* when he disturbed her privacy. She rushed to where the apartments of the old queen stood for help and protection. But he seized her in a ruffianly manner and dragged her to the hall. There must be some appreciable distance in a royal palace between the women's quarters and the council-hall.

This story, therefore, is something thoroughly irreconcilable with that contained in the first passage above. The Bharata specialists, either those who introduced the second paragraph or those who were concerned with the redaction, perceived the difficulty and, accordingly, they altered the first passage to make it appear that she did not put in appearance at the hall. रजस्वला was slipped in, in substitution for some other word that stood there. अयोनीवी changed into अयोनीवी. The nominative case form was converted into the vocative and the terminal त् was removed. The Dravida scholars went farther to make the idea clearer.

The second passage is also rendered into Telugu by the translator. His position was certainly not a

comfortable one. The episode was a very important one. He might be struck with the contradiction. It was not for him to probe into the why and the wherefore of it. It was all the work of Vyasa. He had to translate it as he could not suppress it. And that was all. One thing appears, that both versions existed in his time; that the first paragraph was either not altered, or, if altered, the amended matter did not find its way into the Telugu author's copy. The idea of summoning the princess to the hall, if it found a place in the earlier draft, must have been confined, as is natural, to the purpose of intimating to her the change in her status, as the result of the wager, and to direct her to take her place among the domestics of the royal household. It is not clear that she was wanted in the public hall at all for this purpose.

When Vidura was first asked to go on this mission, the direction to him was to bring Draupadi for being introduced to the slaves in the palace and to the routine of a charwoman's work.

एहि क्षत्तर्द्रौपदीमानयस्व प्रियां भार्या संमतां पाण्डवानां  
संमार्जतां वेश्म परेतु शीघ्रं तत्रास्तु दासीभिरपुण्यशीला

When Pratikami first went to her he said

सा त्वं प्रपद्यस्व धृतराष्ट्रस्य वेश्म नयामि त्वां कर्मणे याज्ञसेनि

'So please go with me to the dwellings of Dhritarashtra, as I have got to assign work for you.' Her answer was:—

‘Let me have his reply, and when I know what it is I shall go with you.’ It will be seen that, neither in

Pratikami's announcement, nor in the lady's reply, was there any mention of the सभा as the place where her presence was required.

This exciting episode of Draupadivasthrapaharanam, as it is popularly known in Southern India, probably attained to its present form in several instalments of revisions and interpolations.

1. The first idea was to represent Draupadi as having been directed to join the herd of domestics and slaves in the old king's household.

2. The next step was to say that she was requested to repair to the great hall; that she appeared there without force or violence having been used to her; that she appeared voluntarily, though reluctantly.

3. The further idea was to state that force was used to her to make her attend in the hall.

4. We next have the attempt to remove the Chādar from her person, in the public hall.

5. This idea was further developed into an attempt to strip the princess of her wearing apparel, and the failure of the attempt on account of her inviolate purity. This was the first form of the miracle.

6. A further development was the appeal to Krishna, and the failure of the attempt to strip her of her dress, because of the divine protection of the Avatar.

7. The finishing touch to the tale was given by embodying the idea of राजस्वला.

In reviewing this episode I have referred largely to the text of the epic in several places. I did this for two reasons. First, the importance of the subject and the necessity to lay bare the scheme of the redactors required it. Secondly, I intended this as an example of the sort of work that has to be done in connection with the question of the genuineness of every doubtful topic or episode in the Bharata.

My purpose was at the outset, to obtain, from a study of the first two chapters of the Bharata, indications, more or less certain, as to the extent to which the text can be relied on for genuineness. It was not my idea to enter into an elaborate research and dig into the text of the several Books for the purpose of supporting my conclusions. To attempt any such thing is more than I could aspire to, without help, means or leisure. It would be nothing short of encyclopædic work. I should point out, however, that wherever there is reason to suspect the genuineness of a particular canto or chapter, a careful study of the text in its proper place is certain of yielding valuable results. In the case of some topics, however, it is necessary to delve into the text. The present is one of them. The connection of Astika's story with the Bharata is another.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

It was pointed out in the study of the first chapter that we notice extensive variations both of text and of sequence among the existing copies. This appears

clearly from a comparison of the Dravida copy with the Calcutta one. It is surprising that the Dravida copy includes thousands of verses (about ten thousands more) not found in the other editions. How or when these extra verses came to be included in the text, it is difficult to suggest. It is clear however that for some cycles scholars of the southern seminaries were employed in adding to the text.

These variations can be seen, almost everywhere in the Bharata, wherever we may open the book. It would be a stupendous and not enlivening task to note up these differences, for they are very numerous and extensive. But, as a fair example of the justice and truth of the remarks made in this behalf, I wish to give the reader some idea of the state of the Sabhaparva. For it is, comparatively speaking, a small Book; and the matter may be dwelt on without, it is hoped, tiring the reader.

Chap. 23. of the Dravida text, जरासन्धकृष्णयोर्विरोधकारणम् is not found in the other copies; it is not wanted. The विरोधकारणम् has been told elsewhere and told well. This additional chapter is really new matter under a doubtful title. It gives a long account of the quarrel between Kamsa and Krishna. That portion of this chapter which is really concerned with Jarasandha has also been given elsewhere.

Chapters 33 and 34 of the Dravida copy are wanting in the other editions. 33 speaks of the advent of Sahadeva, the youngest of the Pandava brothers, into the country of the Pandya, (more than five thousand years ago from now) to levy tribute and presents for the Rajasuya. Chap. 34 weaves out a lengthy story about a mission

sent across the shallow channel 'at the extremity of the peninsula to the island of Ceylon. Vibhishana was the ruler of the island. He was the brother of Ravana, who was slain by Rama, the Avatar, 864,000 years before the alleged period of the Pandavas. Vibhishana was summoned to swear fealty and pay tribute to the Pandavas. This he did very readily and gladly, we are told, out of regard for Krishna. What Vibhishana had to do with Krishna or why he should have made his render out of regard for him, does not appear. Krishna did not accompany Sahadeva. The anxiety to glorify Krishna has supplied the motive for this chapter as also Ch. 23 noticed above.

We now proceed to record a phenomenal interpolation introduced with a set purpose.

Chapters 42 to 61 of the Dravida text, 20 chapters in number, are not known to the other editions. The canto in which they occur is the अर्धाहरणपर्व or the presentation of a complimentary 'nuzar' to some one supposed to be pre-eminently qualified for this regard, previous to the initiation of the sacrifice. It turned out that Krishna was chosen for this honour, at the suggestion of Bhishma. This irritated Sisupala, for Krishna was neither a Brahmin nor a Kshatriya (though he was the God himself). He was only a Yadava or of the shepherd caste and a cadet of a second rate family; and in the opinion of Sisupala (an opinion shared by several), there was very little that could be claimed for Krishna. Sisupala spoke out. This opposition led to a hot and acrimonious debate; and, to advance the claims of Krishna, Bhishma delivered himself of a panegyric on

the virtues of Krishna. The other copies wind up the matter here. But the Dravida scholars went further and compiled a canto of 20 chapters and about 708 verses. The new matter necessitated a slight change in the introductory detail. This spurious canto comprises an account of the several incarnations of Krishna, as identified with Vishnu, and the adventures of the infant, adolescent, and adult Krishna. The last chapter of this collection purports to record the future also of Krishna's life.

Chapters 69 and 70 of the Dravida are wanting in the other texts. They were conceived as the conclusion of the अर्धाहरणपर्व, in conformity with the Dravida interpolation.

In the other copies we find that the earthly career of Sisupala was brought to an end by the throw of the discus at his throat, by Krishna. This occurred in the great reception hall, where they were all seated, and in the heat of an altercation, when the last and culminating trespass of Sisupala was that he claimed to have received in the past the favours of Rukmini, the divine consort of Krishna. Out flew the discus and the head of the offender lay weltering in gore, all in the twinkling of an eye.

The Dravida revisers of the text were not satisfied with this finis to the episode. Two chapters 69 and 70 were supplied. Chapter 69. deals with omens which appeared previous to Sisupala's death.

Chapter. 70. narrates an exciting battle on the field between Sisupala and Krishna, the full stop to

which was brought about by the throw of the discus. The story of the battle is not known to the other texts.

Chap 71 of the Dravida, purporting to give an account, more in extenso, of the Rajasuya sacrifice, is wanting in the other copies.

Chap. 96, a pretty long one, narrates the story of Kartavirya. It is surprising that Duryodhana is the monitor and that the old King, Dhritarashtra, required to be told of Kartavirya by his son. Dhritarashtra's education must have been sadly neglected in youth, and probably did not improve afterwards. But the adventures of Kartavirya and the destiny that overtook him were told by Bhishma in chapters 48 and 49 above, in dealing with the Avatar of Parasurama, and Dhritarashtra was in the audience.

Except the first 16 verses of this chapter (96) the rest is not found in the other editions. The first 79 verses of chapter 97 of the Dravida text are not found in the Calcutta copy. The first 31 verses of chapter 101, Dravida, are not found in the other copies.

They record the sympathy of the townsmen, somewhat overdone, on the occasion of the Pandavas leaving for the forest, after the second game.

Chapter 45 of the Calcutta text is split up in the Dravida copy and a portion of it finds insertion in Chapter 70 and the other portion in chapter 72 of the Dravida copy.

Chapters 51 and 52 of the Calcutta are clubbed together as chapter 78 in the Dravida.

Chapters 56 and 57 of the Calcutta text are joined together and appear as chapter 82 of the Dravida text.

Chapters 84 and 85 of the Dravida are chapters 59 and 60 of the Calcutta copy, but with a re-arrangement of the verses.

Chapters 61 and 62 of the Calcutta copy occur as one chapter, 86, in the Dravida copy. Chapters 65 and 66 of the Calcutta copy, together, form C. 89 in the Dravida version.

Chapter 92 of the Dravida text is compounded of chapter 69 of Calcutta, plus 22 verses of chapter 70 of Calcutta, plus 45 verses not found elsewhere except in the Dravida copy.

Chapter 93 of Dravida begins with 20 spurious verses, then runs on from verse 23 of chapter 70 of Calcutta, the first 22 verses of this chapter (70 of Calcutta) having been placed in chapter 92 of Dravida.

The first 16 verses in chapter 96 Dravida and the verses in chapter 97 of the same text minus the first 79 are found in the Calcutta copy as chapters 43 and 44.

As usual there are repetitions in this Book. It is open to doubt whether there was not a single Dyutam and only one in the first cast of the poem. The way that the 2nd Dyutam was brought about, and the submission by Yudhisthira, after the sad experience of the first Dyutam, raise a strong suspicion against the truth of that incident. It is probable that at first only one Dyutam was thought of. There are no data available however for enlarging on this subject.

Before passing on to the next Book, I wish to state what I consider as suggested by the Parva Sangraha

and the preliminary enumeration touching the contents of this, the second Book.

1. The Rajaniti portion at the head of the Book is probably an interpolation.
2. The canto of Lokapala-Sabhakhyana is doubtless an interpolation.
3. The Digvijaya दिग्विजय has been largely rewritten and elaborated, if it is not entirely new.
4. The Rajasuya canto is a very doubtful one.
5. Chapters 42 to 61 of the Dravida text form an undoubted interpolation.
6. The exciting episode of the humiliation of Draupadi was a late development, and probably assumed its present form in several instalments.
7. Sahadeva's expedition to the Pandya kingdom and the embassy to Lanka &c., is a late introduction.

## CHAPTER IX

The third Book or the Aranya Parva or, as often written, The Vana Parva.

The first thing to be noticed is that the canto-titles enumerated in the अनुक्रमणिका are more numerous and less vague than before. The detail in the Parva Sangraha is surprisingly full even to minuteness. This leads to inferences which will be noticed below.

It is very probable that items not mentioned therein



were not known to the text at the time when the second chapter was finally settled.

The Preliminary enumeration gives the first title as आरण्यकम्. We should understand by that the introduction of the Pandavas into the forest and their making arrangements to stay there.

The next title is किम्भीरवध or the slaying by Bhima of the cannibal or demon Kimmira.

The Dravida leaves out the first title and gives for the first canto the title किम्भीरवधपर्व. This canto reckons 11 chapters. It is surprising that the narrative about Kimmira comes in by second-hand and appears only in the 11th chapter or the last of this canto.

Vidura, who had no personal knowledge of the adventure, narrates the account, from information obtained by him from the Brahmins in the forest. Why the account was not given in its proper place and in the ordinary way of historical narration, as an incident that occurred when the Pandavas entered into the forest, is not apparent.

It is difficult to say how much of these 11 chapters is genuine matter. Kimmira-vadha is appropriately confined only to the 11th chapter. That title cannot in any way cover the previous ten chapters. When we take a survey of the contents of these chapters we are led to think that even the title आरण्यकम् is hardly suggestive of them. The first two chapters record the exodus of a large number of townsmen and Brahmins in company with the Pandavas and out of sympathy for them. They numbered by thousands. They must all have

been together when the Rakshasa Kimmira came on the scene; and yet, the chapter about Kimmira does not show that any others than the Pandavas, their wife and the Purohit were there when the demon turned up. The 3rd chapter records a miracle or boon; Yudhishthira prays to the Sun-God to provide him with the means to feed all the hosts of the Brahmins, during their voluntary exile. The Sun-god gives to him the Akshaya-Patra or never empty vessel or the inexhaustible one. (It is the begging bowl of Buddha and of Siva.) It was kept by the Pandavas during all the 12 years of their forest-residence and it was in daily use. There are two chapters of litany before the boon is conferred. The episode certainly deserved mention even in the अनुक्रमणिका. I venture to think it was not even of lesser importance than the knocking down of a cannibal. It is very probable that the Sun-episode was a later fabrication.

The other chapters are occupied with debates in the council-chamber of Hastinapura, among the Kauravas, as to whether the Pandavas should be recalled. Vidura who advised this step was accused of partisan-ship with the exiles and was told that if he wished he might follow them. He did so promptly but was fetched back. All this is very doubtful matter, but there is the sanction of the Parva-Sangraha, though this justification would show no more than that the matter was found in the text when this chapter was settled.

The next canto named is that of अर्जुनाभिगमनम् or that in which Arjuna goes out to a mountain named इन्द्रकील on which to make तपस् to the God Iswara for obtaining the पाशुपतास्त्रम्.

This title gives absolutely no warranty for the first 25 chapters of this canto. 12 of these are taken up with Krishna's military exploits against a certain Asura township and its chieftain. This episode is introduced on the pretence of explaining the reason for Krishna's absence from the Dyuta scene and his not being then available to the Pandus or Draupadi for help and advice. The Asura chief was a Salwa (hawk totem?) The Asura city was a Kamagama कामगमा, that is, it could fly about in the upper regions like a bird, perhaps like the hawk. The story was devised as a counter-blast to the Tripurasuravadha त्रिपुरासुरवध—a well-known Puranic tale amplified from Vedic beginnings in which the God Siva is the conquering hero.

The purpose was to provide an equally important adventure to be associated with the name of Krishna as Avatar of Vishnu. The overthrow of the Salwa, as told in 10 chapters, was of sufficient importance to deserve mention in the अनुक्रमणिका, especially, as it is independent and not relevant matter.

At the end of Krishna's visit, he departs taking back with him his 'sister' Subhadra and her boy. The other children of the Pandavas are also removed by their maternal uncles. The townsmen who accompanied the Pandavas to the forest are at this stage persuaded to depart. It is surprising that the chapter about Kimmira does not disclose the existence in the forest of any of these citizens.

There are two chapters in this canto, recording the visit of Markandeya to the Pandavas and his departure. There are also other incidents such as the visit of Dalbhya and other Rishis and moral discourses

by them. All this is doubtless new matter. The Parva-sangraha makes no mention of them.

About 9 chapters are devoted to a debate between Draupadi, Yudhishtira and Arjuna and Bhishma. Yudhishtira deprecates the evils of an uncontrollable passion and anger. Draupadi preaches sermons on the domination of fate, on the merits of Dharma and on the moral lessons of Brihaspati: Bhima advises a declaration of war, then and there. Chapters like these are easily conceived and developed.

It may be fairly surmised that these 25 chapters are without warrant.

The canto about Indra Lokabhigamana इन्द्रलोकाभिगमन is hardly justifiable. It must have been an interpolation. For, according to it, Arjuna goes up in the flesh to dwell with the ruler of the Gods in the Paradise of Indraloka. This certainly was a breach of the covenant. It does not appear that any sophistry would convince us that a stipulation to live in the forest and feed on roots and herbs, leading an ascetic life, was satisfied by drinking nectar, and batten on ambrosia, occupying the same seat with the Indra and living in the land of the Gods, amid the well-known luxury and effeminacy of Indra's Court, for a period close on a quinquennium. It was a breach of the conditions sufficient to cause a forfeit. It is impossible that the first author should have allowed himself to develop the story on these lines. It is not improbable that the idea of this chapter was prompted by a slight metathesis, accidental or designed.

Arjuna went to the hill named Indrakilabhigamanam for तपस्. This event is described as Indrakilabhi-

gamanam. This is easily changed into Indralokabhi-gamanam.

There is no knowing in what form Nalopakhyanam found itself originally. The canto of तीर्थयात्रापर्व is a very important one. It has doubtless been extensively manipulated,

The intimation in the preliminary enumeration is तीर्थयात्रा ततः पर्व कुरुजस्य धीमतः 'Then the pilgrimage tour of Yudhishtira.' This would justify an account of the itinerary and some description or incidental detail connected with the places visited. But it would hardly warrant an exhaustive Puranic account of all the places of pilgrimage in the continent, none of which were or most of which were not visited. The detail in the Parva-sangraha is to this effect.

तीर्थाभिगमनक्रिया । तीर्थानां च फलप्राप्तिः पुण्यत्वम् चापि कीर्तितम्  
पुलस्त्यतीर्थयात्रा च नारदेन महर्षिणा ।  
तीर्थयात्रा च तत्रैव पाण्डवानाम् महात्मनाम् .

'The going out on pilgrimage, the religious merits of pilgrimages to the sacred places, has also been told. Narada's pilgrimage to Pulastyatirtha and also the pilgrim-tour of the Pandavas.'

The discourses on the religious merits of each and every one of the sacred places, treated severally, was foreign to the purpose of this canto and probably did not form a part of the original.

It is not easy to understand the relevancy of giving a narrative of Narada's pilgrimages.

The amplification in the Parva-sangraha, intended to cover much of the matter now found in the text in

this canto, is not warranted by the Preliminary enumeration.

This canto comprises in the text 80 chapters allotted to it.

There are many upakhyanam fitted into it, for which no indication is afforded in the Preliminary-enumeration or the detail in the Parva-sangraha, and which could not be foreseen or expected by the reader from a perusal of either.

The first eleven chapters of this canto (78 to 88 in the *Dravida text*), 80 to 90 in the *Calcutta text*, are undoubtedly an interpolation. *Chapters 81 to 85 Calcutta, (80 to 83 Dravida) are copied entire from Padmapurana, which itself has copied the same from Matsyapurana.*

We are told that Yudhishtira proceeded on the pilgrimage, on advice purporting to have been conveyed to him from the world of the Gods, by Arjuna, through the Rishi लोमश who had gone to Indraloka on a visit. But लोमश does not turn up on the scene until we reach the 12th chapter of this canto (chapter 89 in the *Dravida*), that is, until after the close of the copy from the *Padmapuranam*. Chapters 78 to 88 comprise an enumeration and description by Narada to Yudhishtira of a large number of sacred places. It is very curious that Narada does not purport to give this information as a matter of personal knowledge, but reports the account given by Pulastya to Bhishma in times gone before.

Bhishma is one of the Bharata heroes. There is nothing known about Bhishma except through the pages

of the Bharata. It is surprising that the text does not contain any पुलस्त्यभीष्मसंवाद.....at first hand. But in the तीर्थयात्रापर्व Narada is made to report it. This was the form of introduction adopted by the Purana for this episode, for obvious reasons. The writer of the Purana had to find some sanctified names for the matter of his invention, as interlocutors; and the Dramatis Personæ invented by him were adopted without more along with his matter by Bharata copyists.

That this episode about Narada's description of the sacred places and Dhaumya's continuation of the same is an interpolation appears from the Parva-sangraha. The latter makes no mention of these chapters. On the other hand, *it indicates the contrary, by recording, immediately after नलोपाख्यानम्, the advent of लेमश, his visit to Yudhishtira and his report to the Pandavas of the good fortune of Arjuna in Indraloka. The matter is clinched by the note in the Sangraha that, at this point, लेमश conveyed to Yudhishtira—the good wishes of Arjuna and his suggestion that his brother should go on an extended tour of pilgrimage under the guidance of लेमश; and that Yudhishtira approved of the idea and started the pilgrim tour accordingly. Why should Yudhishtira have questioned Narada about the geography and history of sacred places before the idea was put into his head by लेमश? And why, having had so much information from Narada, should he have put the identical question to Dhaumya, as if he had no information at all? It should also be noted that some of these places of pilgrimage were not in the*

forests at all, but in well-populated localities and it was a breach of the articles to go and visit them.

We may take it as clear that Narada's 'Pulastya-Bhishma-samvādanuvāda पुलस्त्यभीष्मसंवादानुवाद (chapters 78—88) Dravida (80 to 90, Calcutta) is an interpolation.

Among the upakhyāṇams in the तीर्थयात्रा canto we find one गययज्ञवर्णनम् which is twice told.

There are 9 chapters devoted to the story of अगस्त्य Agastya.

About 9 to सगरोपाख्यानं Sagaropakhyanam.

„ 4 to ऋष्यशृंग Rishyasringa.

„ 4 to Parasurama's story.

„ 4 to Chyavana and Sukanya.

Three chapters to the catechism of Ashtavakra and 4 to Yavakrita and there are other minor upakhyāṇams also.

These several upakhyāṇams have nothing to do with the narrative of the epic or the subject of the pilgrimage. They are almost all of them Puranic and frequently met with in the Puranas.

Of course, excuses are easily invented for the introduction of this or that story.

The activity of interpolators was at work even with the Ramayana in which we now find many upakhyāṇams, much against the design, tenour and unity of that epic.

Among them may be mentioned as relevant to the present discussion, Sagaropakhyanam, Chyavanopakhyanam (under another name) and the story of Agastya.

This story of Agastya, as we find it in the Bharata starts with chapter 94, Dravida, (96, Calcutta) and is allowed to run on into two other episodes, one of Dadhichi and the other of Sagara.

A reference to the Parvasangraha makes it clear that eleven of these chapters were certainly of later introduction, later even than the first inclusion of this very interpolation.

The detail in the Sangraha stands thus:

आगस्त्य मपि चाख्यानम् यत् वातापिभक्षणम् ।

लोपामुद्राभिगमन मपत्यार्थं मृषेस्तथा । ऋष्यशृंगस्य चरितम् ॥

'Next we have the story of Agastya, in which is told how he ate up Vatapi and how he consorted with लोपामुद्रा for the sake of issue.' 'Next we have the story of Rishya-sringa.' The reference in the detail ends with the nuptials of लोपामुद्रा and the whole of the matter contemplated in the reference is covered only by chapters 94 to 97, Dravida. Chapter 98 should therefore start the story of Rishyasringa which however is not reached until at Ch. III.

It is therefore apparent that the other eleven chapters have no authority to support them.

That at one period आगस्त्योपाख्यानम् really ended in chapter 97 may be gathered from the contents of Ch. 98 which records the story of the lost glory of Parasurama and the recovery of the same by a bath in श्रुतीर्थ.

It thus appears that chapter 98 is concerned with quite a different matter. The opening of chapter 99 is equally suggestive. The writer of the chapter found it necessary to introduce Agastya again for the purpose of the subsequent narration. Let me bring to the notice of the reader that *Some chapters about Agastya in this canto have been copied from the Padmapurānam.*

Chapter 99 records the self-sacrifice of Dadhichi to oblige the Gods. Chapters 100 to 104 deal with the extermination of some Asura clans, known in Puranic lore as Kalakeyas.

Agastya now goes out of the scene altogether. What follows is Sagaropakhyanam which cannot by any device be made to pass under the title, Agastyoopakhyanam. Wherever this episode is narrated in the Puranas it is known as Sagaropakhyanam.

It is the story of the descent of the Ganges and the refilling of the ocean, which Agastya had emptied of its waters by drinking. *There is not the slightest reference to it in the Parva-sangraha.* It is undoubtedly new matter and an interpolation later than the redaction of the Parva-sangraha.

In chapters  $\frac{120, 121, 122}{118, 119, 120}$   $\frac{D}{C}$  we find a record of an extraordinary sympathy on the part of the Yadavas for the suffering Pandavas. In chap. 122 we have a repeated version of गयकृतयज्ञ. It does not appear that there is any authority in the Parva-sangraha for these chapters. No reference can be found in the Parvasangraha to anything contained in chapters,  $\frac{D. 130, 131, 132}{C. 129, 130}$ , Ch. 130, not found in Calcutta, records a trip to Markandeya-

Asrama and a historical notice of that great Rishi. Ch. 131 again gives an enumeration of several holy places. Ch. 132 deals with the sanctity of the river सरस्वती and other streams. Markandeya was a great Rishi and these chapters, if known, would have been noticed in the Parvasangraha. We next proceed to the upakhyanam of Sibi and the pigeon, popularly known as श्येनकपोतीयम्. This is an oft-repeated tale in the Puranas and is repeated several times in the Bharata itself. It is at least a doubtful chapter.

Chapter 141 Dravida (139 Calcutta) records the ascent by Yudhishtira of mount Kailasa, on the top of which the great God Siva had his castle. It is surprising that there is no reference to this in the Parva-sangraha and yet it was not an event to be overlooked.

Ordinary mortals are not privileged to go there in the flesh; and it was certainly not a matter of course even for Yudhishtira, notwithstanding his many virtues.

This chapter also contains an account of नरकावतार and of the वराह Avatar; great events, not to be left unnoticed in Parva-sangraha. Chapters <sup>D. 149 to 152</sup> <sub>C. 147 to 150</sub> require to be noticed. In the first, Bhima, who is going on a quest for the सौगन्धिक flower, meets Hanuman in the forest. This is all the information we have in the Parva-sangraha about the two worthies and anent these four chapters. The introduction of Hanuman has furnished the excuse for detailing the story of Rama, the Avatar, whose right-hand Simian minister Hanuman was. Rama's story occupies two chapters. Hanuman also discourses about old times and the Dharma

of the Yugas and of the four castes. All this matter is extraneous and there is no warrant for it. If Hanuman had told the story of Rama, it should not have been left without some notice in the Parva-sangraha. Take also the fact that Ramopakhyana is told in extenso lower down in chapters <sup>274 to 292 D.</sup> <sub>272 to 291 C.</sub> of this Book and is referred to in the Parva-sangraha. It is very probable that the story of Rama, as told by Hanuman, was not known to the writer of the Parva-sangraha. The errand on which Bhima was sent by Draupadi was to fetch the सौगन्धिक flower for her. This story is the subject of four chapters.

In the third of these, Chapter 155, in the Dravida, (Ch. 154, Calcutta), we are told that Bhimasena fought a battle with the Rakshasas who guarded the mountain on which the flowers blew. The Rakshasas were almost all slain.

In the next chapter we are told that Yudhishtira, with the help of Ghatotkacha, climbed the rugged cliffs to look for Bhima as he did not return in time. He felt sorry for the havoc caused by his brother but was agreeably surprised to find him as the honoured guest of the God Kubera, whose district it was and whose retainers were the Rakshasas that were slain. Yudhishtira had the honour of being received by Kubera as became his rank and with amenities on both sides they parted as good friends.

This adventure is repeated in the quest for another flower in Chapters, 161 Et. Seq. in the Dravida (Chapters 160 Et. Seq. Calcutta).

It is a matter for great surprise that the compilers of the Bharata should have thought fit to shift the scene and elaborate the same idea, through the same processes and with the indetical detail of incident, for no better purpose than the multiplication of pages.

On both occasions the text shows that Yudhishtira met with a warm welcome and a royal reception from the God of riches. At least on the last occasion, the King dined with the God. This event which is of no small importance is not stated in the Parva-sangraha. It was doubtless a later development. Chapter 164 appears to be a later addition. It gives us an insight into astronomical knowledge. Mountains Meru and Mandara are described in the usual way and the course of the Sun, the Moon and the heavenly bodies round Meru is told. There is no reference to this chapter in the Parva-sangraha. Chapter 165 Dravida, (Ch. 164-Calcutta) tells of the return from Indraloka of Arjuna after a prolonged stay there. In the next chapter, we are told of Indra's visit to the Pandavas to congratulate with them on the achievement of Arjuna in the acquisition of Astras &c., and to give them his benedictions. This visit, however complimentary to the Pandus, is not mentioned in the Parva-sangraha.

The above two and some of the following chapters are comprised in the 9th canto as named in the Preliminary enumeration, that of निवातकवचाः. The actual campaign with the निवातकवचाः who were exterminated by Arjuna is narrated in 4 chapters. Ch. 170-173. Dravida. (Latter part of 168 Et. Seq. Calcutta). The two chapters above them, chapters  $\frac{168 \text{ and } 169 \text{ D}}{167 \text{ and } 168 \text{ C}}$  are occu-

pied with Arjuna's own account of his battle with Iswara, the gift to him by the great God of the Pâsu-pâtastra: Of Arjuna's stay in स्वर्ग and the acquisition by him of the Astras. All this is a repetition of matter which has already appeared in chapters 39 to 43 Dravida (39 to 44, Calcutta.), in due course of narration and a second time in chapter 89 Dravida, (Ch. 91, Calcutta).

It is very probable that the matter in chapters 168-169, covering the same ground, is a later interpolation. The probability is strengthened by the fact that the Parva-sangraha contains no reference to the contents of chapters 168 and 169.

In chapter 174 we find it stated that, on the close of the campaign against the निवातकवचाः, Arjuna went back to Swarga, evidently, to receive the felicitations of his divine father.

He appears to have returned to the earth to fight the Paulomas and Kalakeyas of Hiranyapuram, a flying city on the edge of the ocean. After the slaughter of these Asuras he went back to Indraloka and took leave finally from Indra to return to his brothers.

These two visits to Indraloka are not referred to in the Parva-Sangraha. The next canto of this Book is occupied with the riddles of the Python. His capture of Bhima, and the solution of the riddles and release of Bhima achieved by Yudhishtira, is a theme which will be found treated again in another form towards the close of this the 3rd Book. The canto next after this, the eleventh, is मार्कण्डेयसमास्यापर्व. The meaning of the title is not very clear. The canto comprises 50 chapters.

The title has afforded cover for considerable expansion of the contents of this canto. The detail of the Parvasangraha, touching this canto is to this effect.

मार्कण्डेयसमास्याया मुपाख्यानानि सर्वशः ।  
 पृथो वैयस्य यत्रोक्त माख्यानम् परमर्षिणा ।  
 संवादश्च सरस्वत्या स्तार्क्ष्ये स्तुमहत्तमनः ।  
 मत्स्योपाख्यानमत्रैव प्रोच्यते तदनन्तरम् ।  
 मार्कण्डेयसमास्याच पुराणम् परिकीर्त्यते ।  
 ऐन्द्रद्युम्न मुपाख्यानम् धौन्धुमारम् तथैवच ।  
 पतिव्रताया आख्यानम् तथैवाङ्गिरसम् स्मृतम् ॥

“In this canto of मार्कण्डेयसमास्या Markandeya Samasya we have upakhyanam all over. In this (canto) is told the upakhyanam of Prithu son of Vena—also the dialogue between Saraswathi and the Rishi Tarkshya. Then Matsyopakhyanam is narrated. *And this Markandeya-samasya is spoken of as a Purana.*”

“The upakhyanam of Indradyumna as also of Dhundhumara, the story of the Pativrata (the chaste woman) as also (the upakhyanam of) आङ्गिरसम् (Angirasam) are likewise noted.”

It will be seen from the above that the detail of the Parva-sangraha includes much that the title of the canto does not warrant. Reading the detail cited above, it looks as if the summary of this canto was wound up with the remark *Italicised above*. The author of the summary starts with the general observation that this canto is a string of upakhyanam. He follows up with a specification of the several upkhyanam and winds up with the remark that this canto is regarded and treated as Puranic.

In the first place it is clear that a long time must have elapsed between the compilation of the canto and the notice of it in the Parva-sangraha.

Secondly, there is a clear admission about the this canto being Puranic. This suggests that it was either copied or adapted from the Puranas.

The remark about the matter of this canto being Puranic, the canto, being named at first as a canto and named again as a chapter of a canto, is consistent only with the idea that the notice of it by the compiler of the Parva-sangraha closed with the remark *underlined* above.

The lines that follow lack connection in idea or Syntax with the foregoing verses. It is probable that they (ऐन्द्रद्युम्न.....स्मृतम्) were introduced later into the Parva-sangraha. If that was so, it is probable that the upakhyanam about Indradyumna and Dhundumara, the Pativrata and Angiras, were of later adoption. In the case of these several upakhyanam each is prefaced with moral discourses and wound up with similar.

Among the upakhyanam now found in this canto the undermentioned are not noticed in the Parva-sangraha. This is surprising especially in view of the fact that some are mentioned and there is nothing to suggest that the list is not exhaustive. No word like ‘etcætera’ or other is used to indicate the existence of upakhyanam not specified.

We have thus unnamed :—



- Chapters. 193 भविष्यल्लोकवृत्तान्तकथनम्  
 „ 194 कृतयुगलोकवृत्तान्तकथनम्  
 „ 195 मण्डूकोपाख्यानम् and वामदेवमहिमा  
 „ 196/7 बकशक्रसंवाद and शिविचरित्रं  
 „ 198 विप्राय गोप्रदानरूपययातिकथा  
 „ 199 सेदुकवृषदर्भचरितकथनम्  
 „ 200 श्येनकपोतीयम्  
 „ 201 अष्टकादिराजतारतम्यकथनम्

We may safely infer that these unnamed upakhyānams did not find insertion in the text when the Parva-sangraha was settled.

The first two in this list are not exactly upakhyānams but that would not remove the difficulty. For that in itself was greater reason for some express notice of them. For in no way could they be covered by any 'ejusdem generis' argument, assuming the same to be available. पतिव्रतामाहात्म्यम् which we find in chapters 208 and 209 creates difficulty. Is this the episode referred to above in the summary of the parva-sangraha? Most probably not.

There is a पतिव्रतामाहात्म्यम् noted in the Preliminary enumeration. But that comes just before रामोपाख्यानम्. Let us read the reference in the Preliminary enumeration again. The text runs thus पतिव्रतायामाहात्म्यम् सावित्र्यैश्वर्यमद्भुतम्. As I understand the line, पतिव्रतायाः is an adjective qualifying सावित्र्याः, and means the greatness of the chaste woman named सावित्री. This upakhyānam occurs *after* the story of Rama and, apart from this reference, there is no note of any other पतिव्रता in the Preliminary enumeration. So that it is clear that the पतिव्रतोपाख्यानम् of the Preliminary enumeration cannot

be the same as that found in the canto of Markandeya Samasya.

There are eight cantoes between the canto of Markandeya Samasya and the story of सावित्री Savitri named as a canto in the Preliminary enumeration.

The authors of the canto of Markandeya Samasya seem to have introduced on their own account the पतिव्रताख्यानम् related in chapters <sup>208 and 209 D.</sup> <sub>204 and 205 C.</sub>, and it seems to have been steadied in the text when the Parva-sangraha was redacted. The idea probably was to support it by a construction of the note in the Preliminary enumeration which however cannot be justified. It is not permissible to split up the adjective and the noun, treating them as two substantives, intended for two individuals.

However that may be, मार्कण्डेयसमास्या finds a place in the enumeration as a separate canto, and the story of Savitri is named 9 cantoes lower down, as another canto by itself. The latter therefore cannot be confounded with a पतिव्रता story embedded in the canto of Markandeya Samasya as a chapter thereof. Of course there was room enough in this canto for any number of upakhyānams. The पतिव्रतोपाख्यानम् of this canto is really confined to chapters 208 and 209. The subsequent chapters associated with this name have nothing to do with it or the पतिव्रता. The connection, if such it can be called, between these additional chapters (known as the discourse of the धर्मव्याध or the righteous fowler) and the पतिव्रता is that, in chapter 209, she tells the Brahmin mendicant to go to the धर्मव्याध

for instruction and enlightenment. A connection like this is very easily invented.

The fact remains that the reference in the पर्वसंग्रह does not authorise the धर्मव्यास chapters. They are 10 in number from  $\frac{210 \text{ to } 219. \text{ D.}}{206 \text{ to } 215. \text{ C.}}$ . The धर्मव्यास was a great philosopher not withstanding his humble calling. He lectures to the Brahmin on several topics of social ethics, filial duties, Vedantism and philosophy. The पतिव्रता has nothing to do with anything contained in chapters 210 to 219. It is apparent therefore that the reference in the Parva-sangraha to the story of the Pativrata as a part of Markandeya Samasya cannot be reasonably held to cover the chapters 210 to 219.

These chapters at least are a late interpolation.

The next item to be noticed is chapter  $\frac{\text{D. } 220}{\text{C. } 216}$ , Angirasopakhyanam. This is noted in the Parva-Sangraha. But what follows is not. Chapters  $\frac{221 \text{ to } 224. \text{ D.}}{217 \text{ to } 221. \text{ C.}}$  deal with the pedigree of the Agnis (in the plural), that is of personified Fires or Fire-Gods, as we may choose to understand. This matter has nothing to do with the story of Angiras. Again, in the 9 following chapters from  $\frac{\text{D. } 225 \text{ to } 233}{\text{C. } 222 \text{ to } 230}$ , we have the life-history of Skanda, the son-god Kumara, a matter pecuniary appropriate for the Skandapurana.

Absolutely no support for this can be deduced from the Parva-sangraha. It is an undoubted interpolation.

We have next the 12th canto, that of the conversation between द्रौपदी and सत्यभामा In the first chapter

of this canto  $\frac{\text{Ch. } 234\text{-Dravida}}{\text{Ch. } 232\text{Calcutta}}$  Draupadi discourses on the virtues of wife-hood.

Chapter 237 Dravida, (235, Calcutta). speaks of Dhritarashtra's grief for what he anticipated as the future destiny of his children, in contrast with the good fortune of the Pandavas. \*This is a second elaboration of the same idea as was treated in chapter 48 Dravida (51 Calcutta) in connection with which we find a reference in the Parva-sangraha, but there is none to suggest the contents of chapter 237.

This chapter is supposed to begin the 13th canto, that of वीरयज्ञा. In what exact form this canto was originally made up we have no means of knowing. But there can be no doubt that it was largely elaborated subsequently.

The excuse for the वीरयज्ञा episode was a very silly one. It was due to the suggestion of Karna, that Duryodhana should make a military display in the forest in which the Pandavas dwelt to excite their envy or jealousy.

The military prowess of Duryodhana, such as it was, was well-known to the Pandavas and required no display. Certainly, it was not such that any amount of display should have excited the envy or jealousy of the injured Pandavas.

The real purpose of the canto was to depict the utter humiliation of Duryodhana.

Duryodhana's warriors and men were routed in battle by the Gandharvas and he was himself taken prisoner. His release was procured by the good offices

of the Pandavas, of whom Arjuna prevailed in battle over the victorious Gandharvas.

The episode very naturally and properly ends here. *But, in the text*, it does not end here. For there is a sequel to it. Duryodhana contemplated suicide, out of sheer disgrace and humiliation, on account of his defeat in battle and, what was worse, his deliverance due to his cousins whom he had so much wronged.

Duryodhana's friends reason with him against his worse instincts, but, apparently, without any good.

Then they have recourse to incantations. By the success of the spells, a sprite from the shades below is called up and takes Duryodhana down to Pandemonium. The devils there succeed in reasoning him out of his suicidal determination. He is again brought up to the upper world and left in his camp. He goes home and Bhishma counsels, as he did on other occasions, a compromise with the Pandavas, but in vain. To wipe off the disgrace of the events in the Ghoshayatra, Karna starts on a campaign for दिग्विजय and Duryodhana performs a sacrifice. At the end, Karna swears that he will slay Arjuna-some day.

The incidents, subsequent to the deliverance of Duryodhana from the hands of the Gandharvas, form the subject of 11 chapters from  $\frac{248 \text{ to } 258 \text{ D.}}{246 \text{ to } 256 \text{ C.}}$ . This portion of the text is generally known as the canto of Prayopavesana प्रायोपवेशन, which means a determination to commit suicide by voluntary starvation. There is no warranty for it in the Preliminary enumeration which speaks only of Ghoshayatra घोषयात्रा. The प्रायोपवेशन incidents might be claimed as included in

the other title. But even the Parva-sangraha detail is opposed to any such claim. For the note about घोषयात्रा in the said detail is very clear. It runs thus :—

घोषयात्राच गन्धर्वै र्यत्र बद्धः सुयोधनः

द्वियमाणस्तु मन्दात्मा मोक्षितोऽसौ किराटिना

'And then (we have) the Ghoshayatra in which the muddle-headed Duryodhana was taken prisoner and bound by the Gandharvas; and, while being carried away by them in disgrace, was rescued by Arjuna.'

The next line in the Parva-sangraha speaks of मृगस्वप्नोद्भव or the visit of the wild beasts. This canto occurs in the text after the Prayopavesana chapters.

It is thus abundantly clear that the Parva-sangraha knows nothing of the Prayopavesana incidents. If known, they should certainly have found mention therein.

The contemplated suicide of Duryodhana, which seems to have been seasonably averted for the unchecked progress of the epic, and his visit to the regions below, were not events which deserved or required no mention in the detail of the Parva-sangraha.

It follows that this interpolation was of even later date than the Parva-sangraha.

The defective references in the 2nd chapter appear to have been noticed early, as is apparent from an attempt made to supplement the text of the Preliminary enumeration, by the southern scholars. In the Dravid text of the Preliminary enumeration we find प्रायोपवेशनाम् added on as a canto-title next to घोषयात्रा. But, this addition is not found in the other copies.

This additional insertion in the list of the cantoes points to the consciousness of the scholars who attempted it that the प्रायोपवेशनम् canto could not be justified as an extension of वीषयात्रा and that it should be treated as an independent canto requiring separate mention

Let me cite also the example of the Telugu Preliminary enumeration in which Ghoshayatra and Prayopavesanam are named as independent cantoes, two out of the hundreded. The Telugu author must have followed the Dravida reading in this respect. There is also the fact that, in the postscripts, the title प्रायोपवेशनम् is not recognised in any of the copies. But these chapters go under the title of वीषयात्रा. This fact is significant as pointing to the circumstance that वीषयात्रा was the older canto and so recognised and the latter more modern.

Weighing these several considerations we may regard it as certain that the प्रायोपवेशनम् chapters form a late interpolation.

The next canto, the 14th, is मृगस्वप्नोद्भवः. It sounds like an Æsop's fable. Yudhishtira sees in a dream a deputation of the Ferâe-naturâe of the forest, waiting on him to complain that the forest was being denuded of its denizens to supply his table, and to request him to be so good as to shift his camp to some other forest. On the morrow he complies with the prayer.

This canto has only one chapter to it, a somewhat singular distinction.

This canto is mentioned in the Preliminary enumeration as also in the Parva-sangraha detail.

We pass on to the 15th canto, entitled वीहिद्रौणिकमाख्यानम्, which has similar sanction. It is an episode devised to extol the virtues of self-sacrifice and charity.

The next canto is the 16th, that of द्रौपदीहरणम् or the rape of Draupadi. A perusal of the text in its place creates the impression that this episode of Draupadi-haranam has been greatly elaborated. But more than that cannot be stated here.

The note in the Parva-sangraha speaks only of Bhima chasing the offender. But the text associates Arjuna also with him.

In chapter 273 Dravida, (ch. 271, Calcutta), which is formed into a separate canto in the texts, Jayadratha, the ravisher, is caught and bound with ropes. He is kicked about and submitted to a humiliating tonsure and let off in the end by the grace of Yudhishtira. The episode does not end here. We are told that Jayadratha subsequently made तपस् to Iswara and obtained a boon that, for the space of one day, he should prevail in battle against all the Pandavas except Arjuna. But this incident, a very important one, as will appear in the account of the war, is not referred to in the Parva-sangraha.

Next we have Ramopakhyanam, canto the eighteenth. The story of Rama, the Avatar, is told in 19 chapters  $\frac{274 \text{ to } 292 \text{ D.}}{272 \text{ to } 291 \text{ C.}}$ . Chapter  $\frac{293 \text{ D.}}{291 \text{ C.}}$  is by way of epilogue. This upakhyanam placed in the Bharata is an interpolation. The Bharata version is very valuable for a critical study of the Ramayana.

We have then in the 19th canto the story of Savitri,

the chaste wife—another interpolation. *The Bharata text of this upakhyanam was copied from the Matsyapurana-*

The 20th canto is named कुण्डलाहरणम् in the Preliminary enumeration. The detail of the Parva-sangraha as to this title is confined to the idea of the deprivation by Indra of Karna's ear-rings. Karna was born with the ear-rings and the coat of mail. They formed part of his anatomy at birth.

It was apprehended that, with this accoutrement he would be invincible for Arjuna. To make him a less formidable foe, Indra hit on the idea of depriving Karna of the same. He succeeded in getting possession of them by cajoling Karna to give them up. Karna's generosity has passed into a bye-word.

The note in the अनुक्रमणिका and the पूर्वसंग्रह speaks of only the Kundalas or the ear-rings. But the text includes also the coat of mail. How this happened is not clear.

Indra gives Karna, as a substitute, a Sakti, which was but a poor substitute. This then is all the information warranted by the notes in the Preliminary enumeration and the Parva-sangraha detail. But the episode in the text covers 11 chapters from  $\frac{301 \text{ to } 311 \text{ D.}}{299 \text{ to } 309 \text{ C.}}$ . Of these only 4 chapters can be justified by the references above. The other 7 from  $\frac{305 \text{ of } 311 \text{ D.}}{303 \text{ of } 309 \text{ C.}}$  give, in extenso, the history of Karna's birth and growth. There is no authority whatever for these chapters in the references. The story of the birth of Karna is repeatedly told in the Bharata. We have had it already once before. We shall have it yet again.

There can be no doubt that this is an interpolation.

Canto the 21st and the last deals with the riddles of a Yaksha, somewhat like those of a sphinx. It is a repetition of the idea treated already in the canto of आजगरम् discussed above.

As regards the sequence observed, one upakhyanam calls for remark. It is ऐन्द्रयुग्मम्. The Preliminary enumeration ranks it as a canto by itself. Apart from that, its place in the list occurs after ब्रीहद्रोणिकमाख्याम्. Between the admittedly Puranic matter of मार्कण्डेयसमास्या and ऐन्द्रयुग्मम् the enumeration places four upakhyanams (cantoes). But strange to say, we find ऐन्द्रयुग्मम् as a chapter of मार्कण्डेयसमास्या in all the versions. How this is to be justified is not clear.

As stated previously, we find in this Book, in the canto of तीर्थयात्रापूर्व, the upakhyanam of Jamadagnya or Parasurama; and in the मार्कण्डेयसमास्या canto we find वैव्योपाख्यानम्. Both of these are seen in the Preliminary enumeration, associated, in sequence, with the cantoes forming the 5th Book or Udyogaparva, in which, as a matter of fact, these upakhyanams are not found at all. How they came to be included in the 3rd Book cannot be explained.

Variations of sequence in the arrangement of the chapters and repetitions of matter are found in this Book as in others. It should be borne in mind that the detail in the Parva-sangraha as regards this Book is very full. It is set out in 60 Anushtubhs or 120 lines. We may safely take it that the items not noticed in the Parva-sangraha were additions of a later date. As the result of the foregoing discussion

the undermentioned suggestions are offered as to the text of the third Book, Vanaparva:—

1. The chapters relating to the voluntary exile of the Brahmins and citizens into the forest, along with the Pandavas, are probable interpolations.

2. The debates in council as to whether the Pandavas should be recalled from the forest and Krishna's campaign of Salwopakhyanam are undoubted interpolations.

3. Indralokabhigamanam is probably a yet later introduction.

4. The first visits of Markandeya and Dalbhya and much of the तीर्थयात्रापर्व must be rejected as spurious.

5. The chapters entitled पुलस्त्यभीष्मसंवादावुवाद (Pulastya Bhishma Samvadanuvada) form an undoubted interpolation and *at the same time a copy from the Padma Purana, which itself has copied from the Matsya-Purana.*

The continuation of this संवाद by the discourse of the priest Dhaumya धौम्य is an interpolation.

6. There is no justification for any of the तीर्थयात्रा matter before (लोमश) Lomasa's advent.

7. The upakhyanam in the तीर्थयात्रापर्व are again interpolations.

At least 11 chapters of Agastyopakhyanam are later even than the Parva-sangraha.

Sagaropakhyanam—the outburst of sympathy of the Yadavas for the Pandavas,—the trip to Markande-

yasrama—Yudhishtira's tour to Kailasa—the repetition of the सौगन्धिक idea—Hanuman's story of Rama and his moral discourses;

All these may be regarded as spurious.

8. *Some of the Agastyopakhyanam found in the Bharata has been copied from Padmapurana (Vol. III C. 19).*

9. The affair with Kubera, the chapters on—सगोळ, the visit of Indra and the third visit to Indraloka—most of the upakhyanams in Markandeyasamasya—the story of the पतिव्रता—the Brahmin and the Dharmavyadha—the pedigree of the Fire-Gods and Skandopakhyanam;

The canto about Prayopavesanam—the history of Karna's birth and growth as told in seven chapters in कुण्डलाहरणपर्व ;

All these must be regarded as interpolations.

10. ऐन्द्रबुध्नम् and जामदग्न्यम् found in this Book ought to have had no place here.

11. *The Savitri-upakhyanam has been copied from the Skanda Purana with some additional verses.*

### BOOK III.

#### CHAPTER I.

Let us proceed to the discussion of the IVth Book, the Virata Parva. The titles of the Preliminary enumeration appropriate for this Book are 6 in number. Of these, the 1st is left out in the postscripts. The Sanskrit texts agree as to the sequence and adoption of the other five in the postscripts. The Telugu enumeration leaves out two titles Pandava-pravesa Parva and Samayapalana Parva; but the matter appertaining to these two titles is duly rendered into Telugu, and is made to pass, presumably, under the first of the five titles. The fourth Book is not replete with incident. Some of the chapters, however, appear to have been largely developed, especially, in the battle scenes of the Gograhana canto. Happily, we have been spared the inclusion of Upakhyanas and Puranic matter in this Book. The detail in the Parvasangraha is sufficiently suggestive of the contents of this Book. The difficulty, however, remains that we cannot tell how much here and there was later contribution in the composition of this Book and how much could be taken as representing the first cast. This difficulty is always present where spurious matter is associated with relevant and legitimate titles. A comparison of the Dravida text with the Calcutta copy creates the impression that the whole of this Book was re-written at some remote period.

This revision took place probably in the Southern Districts of the Peninsula. In no other part of the

Bharata is the divergence between the existing versions so great.

This Book, Virata Parva, is the portion of the Bharata most extensively read in the South. With respect to the Bharata it stands in much the same position as सुन्दरकाण्ड occupies in the Ramayana as a popular favourite.

It is read and caused to be read as a religious act to avert evil, as being auspicious in a great degree. The reason for this reverential feeling appears to be:—

1. That in this Book we see the end of the Pandava exile.
2. Their future success in the ensuing war was foreshadowed by the success of Arjuna against a special combination of all the Kaurava generals who afterwards led in the war by turns.
3. The Book ends with the marriage of the daughter of the king of Virata. The princess was married to Abhimanyu the son of Arjuna.

The superstitious reverence with which this Book was regarded would appear to have prompted busy Brahmin scholars to re-write the Book with considerable additions, improving on the foundation of pre-existing chapters.

No chapter of this Book of the Dravida copy agrees in its entirety with the corresponding one of the Calcutta edition.

Extra verses, occasionally out of all proportion, are often interspersed. New chapters have been slipped in,

The sequence of the chapters has been largely altered.

It should be kept in mind, that in this Book, the Pandavas are alleged to, have lived a life of incognito. The consequence of a discovery of the identity of even one of them would have been disastrous, as entailing a repetition of the exile for thirteen years.

We are also told that the spies and emissaries of Duryodhana were busy going about the whole country.

Bearing this in mind we should suppose that the author of the original text would have framed the incidents in such a way as to make it impossible for the identity of the Pandavas to be discovered.

But a cursory examination of this Book betrays that the revisers of the text entirely forgot to bear any caution in their minds, in this particular, and allowed no deterrent to a riotous imagination.

Criticism directed to show all this is not quite within the province of these notes.

For the present, it is sufficient to state that, as we read the text, it is clear that any one, with even a casual acquaintance with the Pandavas or even hearsay knowledge of them, could easily have discovered their identity. The wonder is that the agents of Duryodhana, who, doubtless, strained every nerve to discover the Pandavas, should not have obtained any knowledge of their whereabouts.

One chapter in this book may be fairly marked as an interpolation. The murder of Kichaka by Bhimasena is followed by an aftermath. We are told that Kichaka had 104 or 105 brothers. When they heard of the untimely end of their brother and how it was brought about, they swore they would kill the Sairandhri or burn her on the funeral pyre with the body of their brother. When they attempted to put this threat into execution, they were brought into contact with Bhimasena, as the result of which they were all slain in a trice.

The Parvasangraha does not make any mention of Kichaka's Brothers or their temerity or tragic end. The Preliminary-enumeration refers to the 'Kichakas' in the plural. This may lend colour to an argument that the story of the junior Kichakas is covered and provided for. We cannot, however, set great store by this fact. The preliminary note says कीचकानाम्. The singular form would be कीचकस्य. If the text contained the singular at first, it is easily changed into the plural, without affecting the quantity of the syllables or the metre of the verse. The utter absence of any reference in the Parvasangraha to this incident should be conclusive on the matter. We may take it that the story is a late interpolation.

In the Dravida text, the order, in which the Pandavas present themselves at the Court of Virata, seeking service under him, stands in a way different from that which we find in the Calcutta text.

I give the order in the two texts below for comparison.



## CALCUTTA TEXT.

1. Yudhishtira.
2. Bhimasena.
3. Draupadi.
4. Sahadeva.
5. Arjuna.
6. Nakula.

## DRAVIDA TEXT

1. Yudhishtira.
2. Bhimasena.
3. Arjuna.
4. Nakula.
5. Sahadeva.
6. Draupadi.

The Dravida records the entries of all the brothers first, in the order of their seniority and Draupadi their common wife is made to present herself last. This seems to have been done in accordance with the familiar idea of the subordination of woman to man, an idea more in evidence in the south than in Hindustan.

This variation of treatment necessitates going backwards and forwards as between the chapters of the two texts, for a comparison of the same. It thus appears from the foregoing that the whole of the Book was re-written in the south and that the episode about the upa-Kichakas is an interpolation.

V. Let us proceed to the next Book, the Udyoga-parva, which is the 5th Book. In the survey of the Preliminary enumeration, it was pointed out that there are several canto-titles referable to this Book, which, however, have not been adopted in the postscripts. It was also stated that, among these titles, the text appertaining to some is also wanting in the Book. The undermentioned are among such titles.

Savitra-Vamadevam, सावित्रवामदेवम्.

Vainyopakhyanam वैन्योपाख्यानम्.

Shodasa Rajikam षोडशराजिकम्.

Sweta or Viswa-upakhyanam श्वेत or विश्वोपाख्यानम्.

It is thus apparent that the fifth Book must have been overhauled by the compilers to suit their own ideas.

Some of this missing matter can be traced to Books other than the 5th. But we are not able to account for this; nor is there any explanation of Vyasa or the Sauti or any commentator, available. It is probable that a long period of time had elapsed after the settlement of the Parvanukramanika and before the Parva-sangraha came to be written. For, we see from the Parva-sangraha that, the canto-titles of the Preliminary enumeration, not represented by appurtenant matter in the text, are not named in the Parva-sangraha at all.

Chapters 9 to 18 of this Book set out a Puranic story related by Salya, the King of the Madra tribe, to Yudhishtira and his companions. The story is about the exile or dementia of Indra, his loss of the kingship of Heaven, and ultimate recovery of the same.

This episode occupies 10 chapters. The first thing to be noticed about it is that it is not mentioned in the Preliminary enumeration. As many as 9 upakhyanams are named in the Preliminary enumeration, which should be found in this Book.

Was there any reason why this particular upakhyanam should have been omitted from the list, if it really formed a part of the text when the Preliminary enumeration was written?

It is doubtless an interpolation and not the less so because it has the countenance of the Parva-sangraha.

It has been shown above that the Parva-sangraha cannot be relied on as positive proof of the genuineness of any particular canto or chapter.

But, however, the reference in the Parva-sangraha is brief and vague. This is all that we have about this canto in the Sangraha:—शान्तिपूर्वम् चाकथयत् येन्द्रविजयम् नृपः, The line means: 'The King (Salya) narrated the story of Indra's success'. There is a very large number of Vedic and Puranic incidents in the history of Indra. To which of these did the allusion in this Parva-sangraha refer? Was it his triumph over Bali or Vritra or Namuchi? The episode found in the text records Indra's triumph over Vritra, then Indra's exile caused by the sin of slaying Vritra, the enthronement and rule of Nahusha during the absence of Indra—, the downfall or overthrow of Nahusha and the return of Indra to his own place and power.

There is no knowing in what form Salya's narration stood when the Parva-Sangraha was redacted.

The fact that this Upakhyanam finds no place in the Preliminary-enumeration is, however, a serious obstacle to the acceptance of this episode as genuine.

The danger of relying on a vague reference to Indra Vijayam इन्द्रविजयम्, as supporting this present episode, is best illustrated by a second reference to इन्द्रविजयम् Indra Vijayam, occurring in the next verse but one. For we find it stated:—

वैचित्रवीर्यस्यवच स्मदाय पुरोधसः

तथेन्द्रविजयञ्चापि यानञ्चैव पुरोधसः.

There is probably some corruption of the text here. The first line is an imperfect sentence without construc-

tion, or connection with the next. But the 2nd line is quite clear. It is in this line that the reference to Indra Vijayam (the 2nd reference) is made.

What then is this second Indra Vijayam?

The प्रजागरपर्व Prajagaraparva in which we find moral discourses by Vidura is a canto that has lent itself to manipulation.

The canto of Sānatsujātam is a set-off to the Bhagavatgita which we find in the next Book. The former is probably a later idea than the latter.

Sanjaya was sent to negotiate terms of peace with the Pandavas.

On his return he reports to Dhritarashtra what transpired in connection with his mission.

There are several chapters about this. But the only one of which the Parva-sangraha gives an intimation is the chapter in which Sanjaya speaks of the very close intimacy between Krishna and Arjuna. Sanjaya's report must at one time have been of considerably smaller dimensions, and largely elaborated subsequently, as a sequel to the developments of the corresponding portions of Sanjaya's interview with the Pandavas.

In chapter 145 we have an account of Kunti interviewing Karna and disclosing to him that he was her own son born before her marriage; that it was therefore unnatural for him to wage war against his brothers, the Pandavas. This is a matter of great moment. It is not referred to in the Parva-sangraha, though we find that Krishna's unsuccessful attempt, at about the same time, to seduce Karna on the strength of a disclosure of

the same fact, independently made by himself, is recorded in the Parva-sangraha.

The old lady had kept her secret successfully up till now from all, inclusive of her own issue. Now she found herself driven to make the disclosure. It is surprising that the situation should have been left unnoticed in the Parva-Sangraha.

There is the further fact that the effort of the lady was supplemented by the unsolicited interference of the Sun-God himself, as the parent of Karna, undertaken for the same purpose.

The efforts of all three proved futile. The hero had plighted his word and would not break it, if all the Gods came down to tempt him. In this respect, at least, he set the example of a higher standard of moral resolve than his tempter, the Avatar Krishna, was capable of attaining.

It is significant that the Parva-Sangraha refers only to the attempts of Krishna but not to the attempts of either of the parents of Karna. These two incidents are therefore undoubtedly without authority.

We must keep in mind that the Generalissimos on both sides were commissioned and appointed in this Book, as is clear from the text. But we shall presently find something to the contrary when we take up the next Book for study.

It is surprising to note that there is a remarkable agreement between the Dravida and the Calcutta copies as regards the text of this, the fifth Book.

To sum up—

We may regard Nahushopakhyanam नहुषोपाख्यानम् and the disclosures by Kunti and the Sun-God to Karna as later additions. So also the episode of Vritravadha.

Several chapters of Sanjaya's reports to Dhritarashtra of the details of his mission to the Pandavas are additions of a later date.

## CHAPTER II.

VI. *The Sixth Book* is भूमिपर्व *Bhishma Parva*. It starts the great war, and records the events of the first ten days thereof. There is little of data available for a criticism of the titles and chapters of this Book. There can be no doubt that there has been much tiresome repetition and bootless elaboration in the detail of the description of the battles alleged to have been fought, and the composition of the armies and units engaged in the field. Some ground covered in the 5th Book is traversed again in this Book, with apparently no higher motive than that of swelling the size of the Book.

The titles of the Preliminary enumeration referable to this Book are :—

भीष्माभिषेचनम् Bhishmābhishechanam.

जम्बूखण्डविनिर्माणपर्व Jambukhandavinirmana Parva.

भूमिपर्व Bhumiparva.

भगवद्गीतापर्व Bhagavatgita Parva.

भीष्मवधपर्व Bhishmavadha Parva.—

भौष्माभिषेचनम् or the consecration of Bhishma as Generalissimo on the Kaurava side, is found in all the existing texts, in the *preceding Book*. How it comes to be stated in the Preliminary enumeration in association with other cantoes going into *this Book* does not appear. There is nothing answering to it in the text of this Book. That being so, how is this inconsistency to be explained?

The Parva-Sangraha does not refer to it at all, either in connection with the fifth Book or with this.

In the summary of contents given in the Parva-sangraha of this, the sixth Book, the first title referred to is the second named above, जम्बूखण्डविनिर्माणपर्व, Jambukhanda-vinirmanaparva. This is a canto about Geography. We shall speak of it presently.

In the first chapter of the Sixth Book we find the opposing armies disposed, ready for action.

In the 2nd chapter we find stated the method employed by the poet for the due narration of the events of the war.

Dhritarashtra was old and blind and stayed at home. Vyasa offered to bestow on the old man the power of sight. The old King, by some irony of fate, declined the offer, as he did not care to look at the horrors and the carnage of the battle. He preferred to hear the news of the war reported to him from time to time. Sanjaya was chosen as the eye-witness-correspondent and chronicler; Vyasa bestowed on Sanjaya a sort of second sight, by which he could see and hear everything that was done or spoken on the battle-field. He could also fly in the air to the

front. If he chose to move about the field, in the thickest of the action, he would pass and repass unscathed, bearing a charmed life. Everything spoken would be wafted to his ears whatever the distance. Everything left unspoken, the very inmost promptings of thought of one and all in the field of battle, would be known to him as to the author of creation.

Thus equipped, he starts the narrative of the great war. But the difficulty is to understand how Dhritarashtra was able to follow him in listening to him. The old king had been born blind. All knowledge that men acquire of the material world through the sense of sight was denied and unknown to him. And it is not even every one that has eyes to see that can quite understand the detail of a battle from a report of the same.

Sanjaya, then, narrates the contents of this and the next three Books.

Why this machinery was devised for recording the account of the war does not appear. This was, undoubtedly, an important manœuvre on the part of the author. It is singular that there is no reference to it in the Parva-sangraha, no word about Vyasa's offer of the sense of sight to Dhritarashtra, or the bestowal of a second sight on Sanjaya. We may appreciate the idea that, contemporaneously with the events of the war, reports were transmitted daily and hourly to Dhritarashtra. But it is Vyasa that wrote the history. His knowledge may have been obtained at first hand. He could have given us the history by direct narration. What we really have is Vyasa's report of Sanjaya's narration. Vyasa's knowledge of Sanjaya's narration could only have been obtained by some occult means, as Vyasa was

not present to hear Sanjaya speak. It is unfortunate that, as the result of this arrangement we get the Bhagavatgita (not to speak of other topics) by a process of quadruple distillation, if not worse.

Krishna discourses the Gita lessons on the battle field of Kurukshetra. Sanjaya, gifted with second sight or second 'hearing', catches every word of the dialogue from his place in the apartments of the palace at Hastinapuram or elsewhere. Sanjaya then repeats the discourse to Dhritarashtra. Vyasa somehow comes to make a note of it by means of some occult knowledge.

He teaches it to Vaisampayana with the rest of the Bharata.

Vaisampayana recites to Janamejaya. The Sauti is one of the audience. He recites in his turn to the Rishis of the Naimisha forest.

The next step was to commit it to writing. We do not know who did that or when.

The above is no doubt true of much of the Bharata.

But the Bhagavatgita at least might have been ushered with better credentials.

The fact remains that the Parva-sangraha makes no reference to the arrangement devised by Vyasa for the narration of the incidents of the war.

Sanjaya's narration to Dhritarashtra starts only after the fall of Bhishma, that is after ten days of battle passed. The words in which he refers to Bhishma are ordinary words in use to express death.

There is not the least indication in the first chapter of the narrative that Bhishma had only been wounded and '*hors de combat*' and that he was not killed in action.

Dhritarashtra understood that Bhishma had been killed in action. The reader understands that he lay dead on the field of glory, where the arrows fell as thick as dust around him.

The reader will therefore start with surprise, when he learns later that Bhishma is not dead, that he has prolonged his life to wait for the Sun to turn the corner at the approaching winter-solstice. This lingering of Bhishma's life was a later idea worked out by astronomical suggestion. Vide Appendix.

But it came in handy for interpolators of yet later generations, who made it their business to forge the 12th and the 13th Books, *i.e.* the Santi and the Anusasana Parvas, which, between them, make up more than a fourth of the entire Bharata.

It is very improbable that the first poet knew anything of this prolongation of Bhishma's life after his death on the field of battle.

And we may safely believe that all chapters of the Bharata which state this 'resurrection' as a fact or depend on its actuality for their own subsistence are interpolations.

We have next the Jambukhand-Vinirmana Parva जम्बूखण्डविनिर्माणपर्व and the allied chapter on भूमिपर्व Bhumi Parva. The two together form a treatise on Geography. The relevancy of its introduction into the

Bharata is better known to the compilers than to the readers.

The whole of the canto of Jambukhandavinirmana Parva is copied from the Padma-Purana. It is without doubt a late interpolation.

Bhumi Parva, the Second of the Geographical chapters named above, is mentioned in the Preliminary enumeration but not in the Parva-sangraha. Why? Was it an after-thought? But it is referred to in the Preliminary enumeration. This fact, however, is certainly not conclusive in its favour; the Preliminary list itself was repeatedly touched up during this long period.

In chapters 16 to 22 and 24 we have a needless elaboration of the description of the opposing armies and their preparedness for immediate action—ideas which were treated fully in the previous book.

Chapters 25 to 42 comprise the well-known Bhagavatgita, which for centuries, has supplied the foundation for the theory of religion and metaphysics of all schools of thought in India. At what period it came to be known by the compendious title, now popularised as भगवद्गीता, Bhagavatgita, is not known. The Preliminary enumeration refers to it by that name.

But the detail in the Parva-sangraha does not use this name. It is not in itself sufficiently precise in indicating the contents of this treatise. This is what we have :—

कश्मलम् यत् पार्थस्य वासुदेवो महामतिः  
मोहजम् नाशयामास हेतुभिर्मोक्षदक्षिभिः.

“In this Book (the VIth)\* we shall find that, the perturbation of Arjuna’s mind, caused by his ignorance, was set at rest by Vasudeva, adducing arguments calculated to lead to salvation.” Reading the note in the Parva-sangraha about the VIth Book, it appears that similar language was used in the case of an exposition by Vidura.

This periphrasis, I imagine, was not the right way to refer to the Bhagavatgita, if it had been known by that name already.

The next item of information noted in the Parva-sangraha is, that Krishna so far forgot the vow he had taken not to fight in this war, that he leaped out of Arjuna’s chariot, with the horse-goad in his hand and went for Bhishma to kill the latter.

This idea is found repeated in the text. It is worked out twice. We have it for the first time in chapter 59, in the Dravida text, in which Krishna rushes out in a fury with the Chakra or Discus in his hand to kill Bhishma but he is restrained by Arjuna.

The second time we find Krishna in a similar situation in ch. 106. This was certainly overdoing it. For, it is not probable that the poet would have allowed the Avatar to be betrayed a second time into this indiscretion. It is probable that ch. 59 is an interpolation. It speaks of the Chakra as the weapon sought to be used against Bhishma, and, if used, should certainly have put an end to the Patriarch. In the Parva-sangraha, however, the reference is to the effect that Krishna rushed out with the horsegoad. Now, referring to Chapter 106, we find it stated that

Krishna leaped out with the horsegoad. It is thus clear that the reference in the Parva-sangraha is to the matter of Chapter 106 and not of Chapter 59.

There is another consideration. Krishna rushed out to slay Bhishma when he (Krishna) was driven to desperation. For nine days they were not able to make any progress against Bhishma. At that rate it was feared the war would never come to an end. The indiscretion of Krishna in forgetting his vow was due to utter despair. To represent this state of mind as having been brought about much earlier in the war would be wanting in propriety and the first poet would not have erred like that.

We may take it therefore that chapter 59 is without doubt an interpolation.

Let us go back to the Parva-sangraha. The line, next after the reference to the Bhagavatgita, speaks only of this incident about Krishna, which is the topic of Chapter 106. But the Bhagavatgita ends with Chapter 42; so that there are 63 chapters, in between, for which there is no corresponding note in the Parva-sangraha.

How many of these existed in the original text, how many were introduced, subsequently, it is impossible to suggest.

In chapters 65 and 66 we find Bhishma narrating विश्वोपाख्यानम् Visvopakhyanam, for which there is no justification in the Parva-sangraha or in the Preliminary enumeration. This upakhyanam seems to have been inserted to glorify Krishna as an Avatar—an idea which may be taken as apparent from the next two chapters. (67 and 68.)

The last two chapters of this Book are probably spurious. There is no reference to them in the Parva-sangraha and yet, if genuine, they were of great importance. Arjuna, after the example of Rama, the Avatar, and other heroes, draws water from artesian fountains by discharging an arrow, to quench the thirst of the wounded Bhishma.

To sum up the result of the above discussion :—

1. The first canto named for this Book Bhishmabhishechanam भीष्माभिषेचनम् is wanting in the text. It has been transferred to the 5th Book; and, even there, it does not figure as a canto but finds its place only as a chapter of रथतिरथसंख्यानपर्व, Rathathiratha-samkhyana-Parva.

2. The Geographical portion of Jambukhanda Vinirmana Parva *et seq* is an interpolation copied from the Padma Purana.

3. The prolongation of Bhishma's life was in all probability, a later idea.

4. Chapter 59 in the Dravida text recording that Krishna in a rage rushed out to slay Bhishma is an interpolation.

The VIIth Book named Drona Parva comes next. It is full of exciting battle scenes. Most of the warring princes were killed out in this Book.

The number of the cantoes into which the Postscripts divide this Book has been made to agree with the Preliminary enumeration. There can be no doubt, however, that there has been much amplification and

elaboration of detail, against which it is not possible from the existing data to direct any effective criticism, by reason of the meagreness of available information.

The detail in the Parva-sangraha is helpful only to a little extent. We find, at the start, that a certain incident is mentioned in the Parva-sangraha.

In the text we find, say, a dozen chapters assigned to that matter. Yet, it is not possible to say how many of these existed in the first copy and how many were later additions.

This difficulty confronts us throughout.

The first incident noticed in the Parva-sangraha is that Drona was consecrated as the Generalissimo on Duryodhana's side, after the fall of Bhishma, and that Drona made a solemn promise to Duryodhana that he would take Yudhishtira prisoner and alive.

We find however that Drona's consecration is not reached in the text until we pass to the 7th chapter, and the promise stated above is recorded in the 12th.

The first four chapters are devoted to a narration of how Karna made up his quarrel with Bhishma, the wounded and fallen hero, a matter of which there is no intimation in the Parva-sangraha. There had been bad feeling between Karna and Bhishma. The latter always regarded and rightly too that the former was the chief agent of mischief on the side of Duryodhana.

Bhishma, almost always, treated Karna with a contempt which he hardly cared to disguise. This feeling and manner were reciprocated by Karna, which

led to occasional incidents of discourteous behaviour on the part of Karna towards Bhishma. For, Bhishma was of the Blood Royal and held the regency for three generations. He was the living head of the dynasty. Karna was of low or humble or unknown origin. He was at best a foundling, though ennobled by Duryodhana.

Karna went so far as to swear an oath that he would not take up arms in this war unless and until Bhishma fell. He would not serve under Bhishma's command. Do we see here a touch of Homer? When Bhishma fell there was a reaction of feeling; and Karna thought that he owed it to himself, as much as to Bhishma, in view of his approaching death, to appeal to the latter for forgiveness of his (Karna's) past trespasses. The idea was good. But it is doubtful whether it formed a part of the first poet's plan.

Some reference to it was indeed called for in the Parva-sangraha.

In the 11th chapter, we find Dhritarashtra breaking out, of a sudden, into a panegyric on the divinity and heroism of Krishna, the Avatar. This was hardly expected and by no means wanted here. It is part of a plan to glorify the Avatar as often and as much as possible. It is stated that this rhapsody was due to an ebullition of devotion on the part of Dhritarashtra; if that was so, it is surprising that the good counsel of the Avatar did not prevail with Dhritarashtra to prevent the war or to terminate it soon after it was begun.

The death of Abhimanyu is recorded in chapter 49.



We have next, in sequence, some upakhyānams, for which there is no countenance either in the Preliminary enumeration or the Parva-sangraha.

It would seem that Yudhishtira is sorely grieved at the untimely end of Abhimanyu and is found weeping. Vyasa at once appears, on the scene to administer consolation to the prince, in the course of which he tells the upakhyānam of one अकम्पन, Akampana, in three chapters. He then starts the षोडशराजकीयोपाख्यानम् or the story of the sixteen kings of ancient history, for which 16 chapters are appropriated.

There is not the least reference in the Parva-sangraha to the appearance here of Vyasa or of the contents of these 19 or 20 chapters; and yet, it was not a matter which should have been left unnoticed.

We may here recall to mind the fact that in the *Preliminary enumeration* the upakhyānams of the 16 kings is mentioned in a context which determines it for the 5th Book. We do not however, find it mentioned in the Parva-sangraha of the 5th Book or in the text of that Book either.

We find it inserted in the 7th Book for which it is not named, either in the Preliminary enumeration or the Parva-sangraha. This is singular. If it ever existed in the older texts, there is no doubt that it suited somebody's purpose to shift its place, possibly with the idea that some upakhyānams were badly needed for this Book to relieve the reader from the monotonous descriptions of battles.

Anyhow it is clear that this is an interpolation.

The next event mentioned in the Parva-sangraha, after Abhimanyu's fall, is the killing of Jayadratha by Arjuna, who was enraged at the part taken by the former in overpowering the young prince Abhimanyu. But before this event of Jayadratha's slaughter is reached in the text, about 77 chapters have to be passed. It is hardly probable that the original draft should have had so many chapters to cover the ground between.

There is reason to believe that as regards the Jayadratha-portion the text has been rewritten.

The following suggestions arise as to the text of this Book.

1. Kanna making up his quarrel with Bhishma,
2. Akampanopakhyānam and Shodasarakam, are probable interpolations.
3. About 50 chapters before Jayadratha's death is reached are of doubtful authority.

### CHAPTER III.

The next book is the eighth, known as Karna-Parva. The Preliminary enumeration knows of only one canto which is assignable for this Book and the title of the canto is the same as that of the Book.

This makes it probable that the original version of this Canto or Book could not have attained the proportions now acquired by it.

The Book as we find it now is divided into 101 chapters. in the Dravida text.

It is passing strange that a Book of this magnitude was not subdivided into cantoes. But this omission

would be intelligible on the supposition that the original copy was not of a greater length than perhaps a long canto.

The Parva-sangraha gives some detail. The first item mentioned in it is the appointment of Salya, King of the Madras, as charioteer of Karna. But, before we reach this point in the text, we find that one eventful day of the war has passed, covered by about 21 chapters, for about 20 of which there is no reference or warrant in the Parva-sangraha.

Salya, at first, pretended to dislike the office and had to be persuaded thereunto by Duryodhana, who had to take considerable pains to make Salya agree.

It was in the course of his effort to persuade Salya that Duryodhana narrated the well known Puranic story of त्रिपुरोपाख्यानम् Tripuropakhyanam, in which all the gods, great and small, are found to have guided the chariot of Rudra, when he went out as the conquering hero to overthrow the Tripuras.

Let us forget for a moment that Salya had, early in the Udyogaparva or the fifth Book, made a promise to Yudhishtira that in the coming war he would play the part of a charioteer to Karna and betray him.

There does not seem to be sufficient excuse for an excursion into the Puranic episode of Tripurasuravadha.

The Puranic character is admitted, in the Parva-sangraha. If it existed in the original text, it would have found mention in the Preliminary-enumeration.

There is no reason why, when many minor upakhyanamams are mentioned, this one in particular, a very important one, should have been left out.

This Book contains another upakhyanam more appropriate for inclusion in a collection of fables than in the Bharata. This is the story of the Swan and the Crow. It is too much to believe that the fable should have formed part of the earliest draft.

It is in this Book, the eighth, that Bhimasena kills Dussasana and betrays his Scythian origin by drinking the blood of the fallen foe.

It looks as if this Book has undergone a large measure of revision. Extensive variation has been noticed in the readings of the text of this Book as between the Dravida and other editions.

In addition to the above, we find the battle scenes rendered in Kavya metre and developed entirely in the Kavya style.

The variation in the readings, referred to above is found to be of greater volume than is usually allowable or explicable.

The revision seems to have affected also the sequence of incidents and of chapters to some extent.

For instance, we find in the Parva-sangraha the death in battle of Dandasena and Danda placed later than the slaying of the Pāndya by Aswaththama. In the text, however, we find the former made to precede the latter.

We may fairly infer with respect to this Book:—

1. That the first twenty chapters are of doubtful authority.
2. Tripuropakhyanam is a very probable interpolation.

3. So also the story of the Swan and the Crow.
4. Large portions of this Book, especially those dealing with the battle scenes between Karna and Arjuna, were rewritten in Kavya metre and style.
5. Some Chapters have been dislocated and there is considerable variation in the arrangement of the matter as between the several topics.

IX. The next Book is the ninth, Salyaparva. The titles of the Preliminary enumeration assignable to this Book are four :

Salyaparva, शल्यपर्व. Hradapraivesana Parva, ह्रदप्रवेशपर्व. Gadāyuddha Parva, गदायुद्धपर्व, Saraswata Parva, सास्वतपर्व.

The Telugu enumeration recognizes these four canto titles. But the postscripts both of the northern and the southern texts have abjured the fourth canto-title. The Dravida text includes the matter of the fourth title in that of the second, and the Calcutta text includes it in that of the 3rd title named above.

The second title is made to include about 28 chapters in the Dravida and only 3 in the Calcutta edition.

One thing is clear that, as the text stood at one time, the Gadāyuddham between Bhimasena and Duryodhana had been closed before the canto of Saraswatam started, which latter had its place as the last canto in this Book.

We now find its place shifted higher up and the Gadāyuddham does not commence until after the close of the Saraswatam.

The motive was probably to keep it in the middle of the Book, rather than at the close, so that its charac-

ter as an interpolation might be less apparent and less open to attack.

The result is that we find Bhimasena and Duryodhana standing in the arena armed with clubs, eager for the mortal combat, and eyeing each other with deadly hatred.

Balarama suddenly turns up there, and the attention of the reader as well as of all those on the field of battle, as also of the combatants, is drawn away at once to listen to Balarama's story of his tour through sacred places, extending over 28 chapters.

This style of developing the plot may suit a six-penny novel better than an epic of the classic period.

Balarama's canto embodies an account of the sacred places visited by him in the valley of the Saraswati with some detail about the sanctity and foundation of such places. It is entirely Puranic in conception and execution. It is quite out of place in the Bharata. We have had similar chapters in the third Book.

In this canto is included the story of the birth and exploits of the Son-God, Kumara, an oft-told episode in the Bharata. No excuse can be pleaded for its repetition here. There need be no hesitation in suggesting that these two topics, the pilgrim tour of Balarama and the story of the birth of the son-god, are later interpolations.

X. The next Book is the tenth, named the Sautika Parva. The Preliminary enumeration shows three titles for cantoes of this Book, if we may follow the lead of the Telugu author and construe the enumeration as

we have done hitherto. The titles are:—सौप्तिकम् (Saupthikam), ऐषिकम् (Arishikam) and जलप्रदानिकम् Jalapradanikam.

For some reason, not apparent nor explained, the last canto, named above, जलप्रदानिकम् or the offering of libations of water, has been, by the postscripts, made to go into the next or the Eleventh Book.

I have no doubt that the Telugu author understood the context in the Preliminary enumeration correctly. For, as indicated in an earlier portion of this study, the titles of the Books were drawn in most cases from the titles of the first canto appropriated to each Book.

In view of the fact, therefore, that the next Book is entitled Striparva, it is very probable that it should have commenced with the canto of स्त्रीविलाप Strivilapa and not जलप्रदानिकम् Jalapradanikam.

There is another consideration.

The texts extant give Jalapradranikam as the title of the first canto of the next Book and fifteen chapters go under this canto-title. But strange to say, there is not one word in these fifteen chapters about the offering of any libations of water; and yet, that is what the word Jalapradanikam signifies.

Another matter for further surprise is that, as the text stands, this render of libations is found only in the *last chapter* of the Eleventh Book.

It is clear, therefore, that the postscripts of the first canto of the eleventh Book speak false. It is also clear that Jalapradanikam could in no case have stood at the head of the eleventh Book.

It is also certain that the canto of Jalapradanikam did, at one time, stand next to Aishikam and not where

it does now stand in reality, *i. e.* towards the close of the Eleventh Book.

It is probable that this change of place was achieved later even than the first formation of the cantoes into Books.

It is not certain that, when the idea of dividing the text into Books occurred, the number of them was fixed at eighteen. This number was developed to satisfy a certain requirement, according to which the Akshauhini or 'armies', using the word for want of a better, engaged in the war, were eighteen, and the war lasted eighteen days.

It seems to me that the Striparva was, on the occasion of some revision of the text, amplified and recast. The original form was, in all probability, a record of the lamentations of the widowed and son-less women *at the palace at Hastinapuram*. The preposterous idea of taking them all to the battlefield of Kurukshetra and making them weep and wail there in the presence of the dead must have been a later one. It is alike opposed to good sense and decency.

We must assume that the dead lay rotting on the field, all the dead who were slain, day after day, during the eighteen days; that there was no cremation, no burial, even among people who were extremely religious and who had ample opportunities to dispose of the dead. Was the idea of such a state of things a natural and probable one to occur to the author who started the epic?

How was it possible that the dead, exposed as they were to the action of the elements and the climate,

should have been recognisable when the wailing women were taken over there to have a look at them?

Was anything done to embalm or preserve them?

Are we to believe that the beasts of the forest and the birds of the air, out of respect for the dead or regard for the living, warriors, suspended their carnivorous work?

And then, let us take note of the condition of Gandhari, the blind old queen. This lady was endowed at birth with sight as good as of others. When, however, she was bestowed in marriage on Dhritarashtra, the blind prince, she took a vow to deprive herself of her sight, for, as a chaste wife, she should not possess an advantage cruelly denied by nature to her husband. She closed her eyes and tied a bandage over them and went through life like that. Her eyes were thus sealed for ever.

She might be able to tell one man from another by the difference of voice, but she was there without the use of her eyes to look at the heaps of the dead and identify her hundred sons thereat. All this makes it clear that the idea was manifestly absurd. Somebody, with more zeal than discretion, was at work to revise this portion of the text and hence we find it as it now stands. It is probable that this lamentation was originally recorded as having taken place at the palace, in the capital city, and that the narrative was in the first form confined to one or two chapters.

That when the war was completed in the Sauptika सौप्तिकपर्व and the survivors left the field to return home, they offered the customary libations of water on

the banks of the river that ran through the champagne ground of Kurukshetra, the Oghavati (the Ochus or Oxus?)

This was done as a necessary preliminary to the return home. Of course there was also the ceremonial bath in the sacred river to procure absolution from pollution.

They returned home and the ladies in the palace were then apprised of the worst and at once there was weeping and wailing.

This is what would be conceived of as the natural course of events by a poet, not actuated by under currents of thought, who was minded to sing his theme and pass muster with others of his craft.

We therefore find the Preliminary enumeration placing the Jalapradanikam canto first and the lamentations of the women next. But, when the interpolator took the women over to the battle-field, the libations could be offered only after all the wailing was over, the cremations were done and the baths were gone through:—the offer of libations being the last act of religious charity which the survivor had to perform for the benefit of the departed soul.

We therefore now find it of necessity at the end of स्त्रीपर्व Striparva. When the Parvasangraha came to be written, the change noted above was either completed, or the Parvasangraha was subsequently altered to suit the accomplished change, with the result that the Jalapradanikam is not noted in the Parvasangraha for the Sauptika Parva, but is stated as the last chapter of स्त्रीपर्व in the Parvasangraha for that Book?

The postscripts, *bétray* a troubled conscience on the part of the compilers. They do not stand in accordance with either what may be suggested as the form of the original draft or with the present text of this Book as it now stands.

XI. *स्त्रीपर्व*. The eleventh Book, *Striparva*. The cantoes of the Preliminary enumeration which should go into this Book are five in number:—*स्त्रीविलाप*, *श्राद्धपर्व*, *चार्वाकवध*, *धर्मराजाभिषेचनिकपर्व*, *गृहप्रविभागपर्व*; (in order, *Stri Vilapa*, *Shraddha-Parva*, *Charvaka-Vadha*, *Dharmarajabhishechanika - Parva*, *Grihapravibhaga Parva*.) i. e., "The lamentations of the women, the offering of *Shraddha*, the killing of *Charvaka*, the Coronation of *Yudhishtira* and the division (among the *Pandavas*) of the palaces and the dwelling houses of the *Kauravas*."

The first thing to be noticed is, as shown above, that the post-scripts give us the intimation that the first canto is named *Jalapradanikam*—an undoubted misnomer—for, the chapters of this canto have nothing to do with libations.

The next thing to be regarded is that the post-scripts admit only two more cantoes for this Book, *Strivilapa* and *Shraddha Parva*. So that, it is apparent that three titles of the Preliminary enumeration have been left out. In this instance, it is not the case of the titles being left out while the matter is retained in the text; it is a case of the matter disappearing along with the titles. For, the chapters relating to these three missing titles have been cut out entirely from this Book. It is difficult to account for this proceeding.

We find these wanting chapters put into the next Book, the twelfth, named *शान्तिपर्व* *Santi-Parva*.

Perhaps their inclusion in the *Striparva* was thought less appropriate. If that was so, one might expect the next Book to open with the first of the three missing cantoes.

But this is not so. It is not until after much spurious matter has been passed, and the 37th chapter of the 12th Book is reached, that we light on the चार्वाक *Charvaka* episode.

The Coronation of *Dharmaraja* is told in chapter 39 and the division of the dwelling houses is narrated in ch. 43 of *Santiparva*.

Another point to be noticed is that, though these episodes are enumerated in the Preliminary list as several *cantoes*, we now find them assimilated as *chapters* under the first title of the 12th Book, which is *राजधर्मावुशासनपर्व* *Rajadharmanusasana Parva*, or a discourse on the methods of polity for kings.

The postscripts therefore have abjured the three canto-titles, named above.

The *Parvasangraha* of the *Striparva* does not disclose the existence of these three cantoes in the *Striparva*. It has been made to agree with the arrangement as now existing in the texts.

It is also surprising that when we look into the *Parvasangraha* for the 12th Book, we do not find any note in it of the inclusion of the three titles missed in the *Striparva*.

There can be no doubt that the missing titles really belonged to the *Striparva* at one time, at least as late as the period of the Telugu translator of the *Mahabharata*, in the earlier part of the eleventh century A. D.

The Telugu enumeration gives five cantoes for the Striparva, the five named above; and in the detail given in the Telugu Parva-sangraha, the author expressly mentions, among the contents of Striparva, the three missing cantoes named above, *viz*, the coronation of Yudhishtira, the killing of Charvaka and the division of the Royal residences.

There is also further help from the Telugu author. He winds up the Parva-Sangraha of each Book with a mnemonic verse giving the name of the Book, that of its first canto and the number of its cantoes, the names and sequence of which can be ascertained by reference to his rendering of the Preliminary enumeration. This is what he says in the memorial verse for the eleventh Book.

క. పర్వును స్త్రీపర్వాదిక  
పర్వంబుల నేనిటను కృపాయుతమై స్త్రీ  
పర్వంబు పదునొకండవ  
పర్వమునా వెలయు సుకవిపండితసభలన్॥

“The eleventh Book known as the Striparva, comprises five cantoes, commencing with canto of Striparva, the first of them.”

There are other points to be noted in this connection.

It was suggested above that the idea of taking all the ladies of the palace and the blind old couple to the battle-field was a later invention. On a comparison with the Telugu text this suspicion gains ground. The Telugu Parvasangraha does not know of this funereal trip.

We find it stated in the Sanskrit-Parvasangraha. But there is no reference to it in the Telugu Parva-sangraha.

It is probable that in the text known to the Telugu poet this trip to the battlefield was not to be found and that in the Sanskrit-Parva-Sangraha-chapter which he had before him there was no reference to this trip.

There is another point.

In the Sanskrit Parva-Sangraha, the first item of information given for the Striparva is that Krishna went to Dhritarashtra after the war was over and the hundred sons of the blind king had been killed in action, to break the news to him; that, *anticipating* Dhritarashtra's dreadful resentment against Bhimasena, Krishna feared that if the latter should chance to appear before the old king he would run the risk of being crushed to death in a pretended embrace by Dhritarashtra; that Krishna bethought himself of an expedient to avert the catastrophe;—that he placed before the old king a cast iron image and pretended it was Bhima; that the old king embraced it with such development of muscular energy that the iron Bhimasena was crushed to splinters.

The second item, in serial order, noted in the Parva-sangraha, is that Vidura administered consolation to Dhritarashtra by discoursing to him on the vanity of all things mundane.

The third item in order is that Dhritarashtra and the ladies of the palace were all taken to the battle-field.

Let us go back a little.

It is clear from the Parva-Sangraha that the incident with the iron image took place at the palace at Hastinapuram and not elsewhere. But when we turn to the text of the Striparva in its proper place, we find the scene of this incident laid on the battle-field of

Kurukshetra and the time of its occurrence was after the royal personages had gone there.

The next thing to be noticed, in this connection, is that this incident, which in the Parvasangraha is placed as the first item in Striparva and as *preceding* Vidura's consolation, is placed in the text of the Striparva *after* Vidura's consolation and after Dhritarashtra's arrival on the field of Kurukshetra. So that, from being the first it has come to be the third incident. If the incident of the iron image took place at the palace, it is apparent that Krishna, Bhima and without doubt the rest of the Pandus must have gone there after the Jalapradanikam, for they could not have returned home without having gone through the ceremonial baths in the river and the libations to the dead.

Once they returned to their homes they would not again go back to the battle-field and indeed there is no suggestion that way.

It is probable that the interpolation of the iron image incident was the earlier one and, as the text then stood, the survivors had just returned to the capital at the end of the war.

When, however, at a later period, the idea of the trip to the battle-field was conceived and worked out, propriety required that the Pandus should still be kept lingering on the field and therefore the image incident had to be shifted on to Kurukshetra from the palace, to avoid the inconsistency or impropriety of sending the Pandus back from the palace to the field of carnage.

The whole arrangement had thus to be changed.

One other thing to be noticed is that the Parvasangraha of the Telugu author knows nothing of this incident of the iron image. There was no purpose to be served by suppressing it. There can be no doubt, therefore, about its character as an interpolation. It has been stated already that the idea of the trip to the battle-field is equally unknown to the Telugu Parvasangraha.

This makes it very certain that that episode also was a later invention.

The wailing of the women has been amplified into nine chapters with sickening detail.

As the result of the foregoing discussion we may take it

(1) that the Striparva was entirely recast by the revisers,

(2) that three cantoes which at one time formed portions of this Book were removed from it and placed in the twelfth Book with false post-scripts,

(3) that the incidents about the iron image and the trip to the battle-field are inventions (not of a high order) of a later period.

#### CHAPTER IV.

XII. The next Book is the 12th, शान्तिपर्व Santi parva, which and its companion volume of the 13th Book आनुशासनिकपर्व Anusasanika Parva are two stupendous forgeries, unsurpassed for the daring involved in the enterprise.



The theory is that Bhishma, who had been lingering in pain and illness on account of his wounds, discoursed religious and lay sermons to Yudhishtira and his companions, transcribed into 375 plus 268 chapters as set out in the Dravida text.

The detail of this Book as given in the Parva-Sangraha is very meagre. It is easily set out.

- १ अतः परम् शान्तिपर्वं द्वादशम् बुद्धिबर्धनम्  
यत् निर्वेदमापन्नो धर्मराजो युधिष्ठिरः
- २ घातयित्वा पितृन् भ्रातृन् पुत्रान् सम्बन्धिमातुलान्  
शान्तिपर्वणि धर्माश्च व्याख्याताः शारतल्पिकाः
- ३ राजभिर्वेदितव्यास्ते सम्यक् ज्ञानबुभुक्षुभिः  
आपद्धर्माश्च तत्रैव कालहेतुप्रदर्शिनः
- ४ यान् बुद्ध्या पुरुषस्तस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वं मवाप्नुयात्  
मोक्षधर्माश्च कथिताः विचित्रार्थाः प्रकीर्तिताः

“And then (we have) Santi Parva, the twelfth, calculated to promote wisdom. In which we find that Dharmaraja was sorely aggrieved at the slaughter caused by him of elders, of cousins, of sons and nephews, of affines and maternal uncles:—

‘In the Santi Parva are discoursed Dharmas (By Bhishma) from the bed of arrows.

‘Kings who are desirous of acquiring sound knowledge should learn these discourses.

‘Apaddharmas as appropriate to time and occasion are also discussed herein, by the knowledge of which a man acquires omniscience.

‘The Dharmas leading to salvation are also treated therein, of considerable interest and information.”

This is all the summary we have for a Book of about 15000 verses.

The Preliminary enumeration has eight canto titles which are assignable to this Book.

1. Santi Parva, शान्तिपर्व.
2. RajaDharmanusasānam, राजधर्मानुशासनम्.
3. Apaddharma Parva, आपद्धर्मपर्व.
4. Moksha Dharma, मोक्षधर्म.
5. Sukaprasnabhigamanam शुक्रप्रश्नाभिगमनम्.
6. Brahmaprasnanusasanam ब्रह्मप्रश्नानुशासनम्.
7. Pradurbhavascha Durvasas. प्रादुर्भावश्च दुर्वासः.
8. Samvadaschaiva Mayaya, संवादश्चैवमायया.

The postscripts however recognise only three of the above titles, the 2nd, the 3rd and the 4th, and accordingly divide the Book into 3 cantoes.

The Telugu enumerations and the Telugu Parva-sangraha record four canto titles; the first four named above.

The last four have been left out in all the editions. Why?

Did these cantoes ever form a part of this Book and if so what episode or topics did they comprise?

There is nothing in this Book or the next about the advent of Durvasas or the debate with Maya.

In the case of Sukaprasnabhigamanam, it is possible that a suggestion may be advanced to connect this title with chapters 333 and 334 (Dravida text).

But we should bear in mind that Sukaprasnabhigamanam is named as an independent canto after the

close of Mokshadharma Parva, and not as a chapter of the same.

After chapters 333 and 334 are passed we have yet 41 chapters more to close the canto of Mokshadharma Parva.

If then the identification of the title in the enumeration with the chapters named above is to be regarded as at all plausible, we must concede that the chapters relating to Sukaprasnabhigamanam were removed from their proper place and advanced into the Mokshadharma Parva. But why should this have been done?

As to the title, Brahmaprasnanusasanam, a suggestion may be made that this probably covers the ground of chapters 360 and 361 (Dravida). But there is one difficulty. There is no Prasna by Brahma, but only a reply to a Prasna by Rudra. If the title stood as Rudraprasnanusasanam it would be more to the point.

There is also the objection, common to this and the item above discussed, that these chapters occur in the Mokshadharma Parva as chapters thereof and do not stand independent of it as cantoes.

After all, chapters 360 and 361 reckon between them only 48 verses and it is questionable whether they could stand for the last canto.

Looking through the contents of this Book, we find the first seven chapters occupied with an account of Karna's life (repeated for the 3rd or the 4th time) and Yudhishtira's lament for Karna; for all which there is no support in the detail of the Parvasangraha.

In the next fifteen chapters we find Yudhishtira overpowered with grief and his four brothers, one after another, and their common wife Draupadi, lecturing to him, repeatedly, on his duties as a Kshatriya and the call on his part to take up the reins of Government.

There is no doubt that this portion has been greatly over-done, if ever it existed in the original text.

We have next several chapters of sermons to Yudhishtira by Vyasa on the same lines, with some anecdotes of ancient tradition, serving as texts for the sermons. Krishna follows in the wake of Vyasa.

Next we have the matter of the three cantoes cut out of the Striparva or the eleventh Book.

We should here observe that the order of these cantoes or chapters has been altered. We may gather so much from the Telugu author's Preliminary enumeration and Parvasangraha.

The order of sequence now existing in the text is that Charvakavadha comes first, then the coronation of Yudhishtira and last of all the division of the mansions.

This is in accordance with the order we find in the Sanskrit Preliminary enumeration, though according to that enumeration, these chapters should have been placed in the eleventh Book.

The Sanskrit Parvasangraha does not disclose their inclusion in the twelfth Book.

In the Telugu 'enumeration', as in the Sanskrit, the three episodes are mentioned as preceding the Twelfth Book or Santi Parva; and the Telugu Parva

Sangraha names them as cantoes of the eleventh Book or Striparva.

So that in the Telugu they are named twice, once in the Preliminary enumeration, and, the second time, in the Parva-Sangraha. In both places, however, the sequence as regards the first two titles is different from what we find in the Sanskrit Preliminary enumeration. In the Telugu we have first the coronation of Yudhishtira and next the killing of Charvaka.

This order is reversed in the Sanskrit Preliminary enumeration.

The Telugu, I am led to think, is more to be relied on.

This is how it stands.

These three titles are named as canto titles in the Sanskrit Preliminary enumeration.

It is clear that they should have been included in the Striparva or the eleventh Book.

They have been removed from the eleventh and put into the twelfth Book, without any mention, reference or explanation.

The order in which the first two should occur in the text has been varied.

But why were these chapters put into the twelfth Book? One circumstance may be suggested. The Bharata story really closes with the eleventh Book or Striparva, notwithstanding the present number of eighteen Books. At a certain period, the Bharata epic closed with the eleventh Book.

If, therefore, these three chapters named above were allowed to stand as the last chapters of the eleventh

Book, it would be too apparent that the epic had come to a close.

The whole of Santiparva would have absolutely no connection with anything going before it, and there would be nothing of the Bharata story in it.

Its character as an interpolation would be apparent on the face of it. For, once the coronation was over and all heretics (whom Charvaka represented) were put down, there was no need of any sermons to Yudhishtira, to reconcile him to the new character of sovereign, for which indeed he had waded through slaughter; and there would be no excuse to make a fresh start with the Santiparva at all.

To introduce the Santi Parva we find the preamble worked out elaborately and dramatically. Yudhishtira sheds crocodile tears, incessantly grieving that he should have allowed himself to wage this war at all, in which all his kith and kin, all the Royalty, the nobility, the chivalry and the yeomanry of the land had been wiped out.

His unwillingness to accept the kingship, his inclination to go to the forest for atonement and penance, much protestation and maudlin sentiment—all these have been depicted with studied care.

But there is a ring of hollowness all about which cannot escape the reader's attention.

Standing on the battle-field, Arjuna was grieved to contemplate the future bloodshed and carnage of his kith and kin.

To quiet his conscience was started by the Avatar the philosophy of the Bhagavatgita, a sermon on the text that killing is no murder.

Yudhishtira did better than his junior, for his qualms of conscience were awakened only after all the opponents had been killed and he had made his way through slaughter to the throne. And yet, it was necessary that he should go through a course of sermons, and the Santi and Anusasana Parvas were accordingly delivered to him orally by the expiring Bhishma.

His brothers, his juniors, lecture to him. So does his wife, so does Vyasa, so does Krishna.

With great difficulty, after labour amounting to a Herculean task, Yudhishtira is prevailed upon to accept the crown for which eighteen Akshauhinis had been exterminated, in a war in which he had caused the death of his Brahmin preceptor by telling a falsehood, and extracted from Bhishma himself the secret by which he could bring about his (Bhishma's) extinction.

All this prelude comprising about 50 chapters was required as an introduction to give countenance to the Santi Parva which was smuggled in by the piety of interpolators.

Forty eight of these chapters have no connection whatever with the Santi Parva.

I should observe here that the note of the Parvasangraha speaks only of discourses by Bhishma, but lends no support for discourses by Vyasa or Krishna or for anything that has been stated in these fifty eight chapters.

The twelfth and the thirteenth Books comprise about a fourth of the text of the Bharata.

They serve as expositions of Dharma. The term is wide enough to include anything composed in Sanskrit from the Vedas downwards.

If instead of 588 chapters of sermons we had 5880, we should be equally powerless in proving their spurious character.

We should thank ourselves that the chapters are no greater than they are in number. One thing, however, cannot fail to strike the reader. To give greater colour to the supposed antiquity of a recognition of these Dharmas, a certain device was adopted.

Much of the matter is discoursed by Bhishma, not as part of his own personal knowledge and observation, but as a dialogue between A and B or C and D of more ancient epochs.

Topics are frequently repeated, two three or even four times. There are dissertations on religious, moral and social duties, on good and bad as affecting a man's salvation, on caste, on births and re-births, on civic polity, metaphysics, on women good and bad and several other subjects.

We also find much anecdotal biography of persons supposed to have flourished in ages by-gone; also nursery tales and fables, more suited for the Panchatantra or the Hitopadesa, find a place in these two volumes.

Most of the chapters in the Dravida text are prefaced with a query from Yudhishtira, calculated to introduce the subject.

This introduction is mostly wanting in the Calcutta text. It was probably supplied much later.

In most of the chapters, the Dravida text admits a larger number of verses than what is found in the

Calcutta copy; one notable instance of this is to be seen in chapter 14 of the Dravida text (Santi Parva), which has 127 verses (Draupadi's lecture to Yudhisht-hira) as against 39 of the Calcutta edition.

Variations in readings and in the arrangement and sequence of chapters occur as usual.

In almost every chapter and Book of the entire text the number of verses found in the Dravida copy is larger. This is more so in the twelfth Book. The reason is obvious. In the case of the other Books we have to do with a narrative, at least, to some extent. In the case of the present *i. e.* the twelfth Book, it is a collection of didactic sermons which could be spun out to any length.

The reader will be surprised to find that chapters 205—211-221-223-224-227-228-326-328 of the Dravida text are not to be found in the Calcutta copy. Who was responsible for these extra chapters? When were they introduced? Was there any supplementary sanction by Vyasa?

Chapter 26 of the Calcutta copy is wanting in the Southern text.

XIII. The thirteenth Book, Anusasanika Parva, is only a continuation of the twelfth Book, of a later date though of the same tenour.

The detail of the Parvasangraha of this Book describes fairly well the character of the topics discussed in it.

"On Vyavahara, on gifts and their acceptance, on the meritoriousness of making gifts. On caste customs, on truth and honesty. On the pre-eminence of cows above

all the objects of creation including gods, on the greatness of Brahmins, on the secret of Dharma."

These several subjects are discussed in 271 chapters. (Dravida text).

No justification can be found for the major portion of them in the descriptive memoir of the Parvasangraha.

What liberties the compilers took in piling up the chapters of this Book may be seen from the fact *that the Dravida text of this Book includes 100 chapters not found in the Calcutta and other copies.* The variations in the sequence of the chapters are also noticeable.

Chapters 3-4-5 and 8 of the Dravida text are found as chapters 27-28-29 and 30 in the Calcutta copy.

Chap 11 of the Dravida is Ch. 5 in the Cal. copy.

12	"	Ch. 8	"
13	"	Ch. 7	"

Chap 23 of Calcutta is found split up into 2 chapters, 61 and 62 in Dravida.

25 of Calcutta .... 131 and 132 of Dravida.

91 .... 140-141-142 "

162 .... 267-268 "

The Dravida Editors note that the chapters numbered 67, 171, 172, 188 to 201, and 255 in the Dravida *are found only in the Calcutta copy* and not elsewhere or in the southern texts.

Chapters 13 to 29, 33, 36 to 44; 53 to 59, 117 to 127; 146 to 153; 165 to 169, and 186 of the Dravida copy *are found only in that text.*

Chapter 253 of the Dravida is not found in the Calcutta copy.

Eight chapters of the northern text from 139 to 146, Calcutta copy, have been added to and amplified in the southern text into 49 chapters, set out as chapters. 202 to 250 in the Dravida edition.

These are some among the results of a comparison of the two texts.

We find retold in this Book the oft repeated story of the birth of the Son-god Kumara and his triumph over Tarakasura.

We may observe therefore that:—

1 the twelfth and the 13th Books are stupendous forgeries.

2. that in the twelfth Book probably four, certainly two, cantoes have disappeared.

3 the missing cantoes of the eleventh Book, put into the twelfth, have changed places *Inter Se*.

4. the 13th Book was of a later period than the twelfth.

5. In the case of both these Books, after their first inclusion in the Bharata they were repeatedly added to in later generations.

6. The thirteenth Book contains in the Dravida text as many as a hundred chapters not found elsewhere.

## CHAPTER V

XIV. *The fourteenth Book or the Aswamedha Parva.* This Book was overdone by the Revisers. The purpose of this Book was to record the performance of an

Aswamedha Sacrifice by Yudhishtira. The chapters germane to the subject are indeed very few, even as we find them in the present undoubtedly amplified condition of this Book.

The Preliminary enumeration has two titles assignable to this Book:—

आश्वमेधिकपर्व Aswamedhika and अनुगीतापर्व and Anugita.

The Dravida has added another canto to the two named above:— वैष्णवधर्मपर्व, Vaishnavadharmaparva. No other text of the Bharata contains this 3rd canto of 23 chapters.

Who placed it in the Bharata and when? Of course we need not pause to ask why?

How little the Preliminary enumeration or the Parvasangraha can be relied on for authenticity may be seen from the circumstance that the authors of this 3rd canto took care to insert a reference to it in the *Parvasangraha of the Dravida text*—a reference conspicuous by its absence in the other editions.

It should also be noted that, for some reason of their own, they thought it better to let the Preliminary enumeration stand as it does, in which, indeed, there is no mention of this canto of Vaishnava Dharma Parva. I may here state again, what I said earlier in this study, that the fact that a particular item appears in the Preliminary enumeration or the Parvasangraha is not even presumptive evidence that such item was really comprised in the earlier redaction of the Bharata. There can be no reasonable doubt that both the Preliminary

enumeration and the Parva-Sangraha were tampered with from time to time.

On the other hand it is very significant that an item which should have been particularised in the 'enumeration' or the Parvasangraha is not named in either or both.

Let me add that the Telugu rendering knows nothing of this canto of Vaishnava—Dharma-Parva, either in the Preliminary enumeration or the Parva-Sangraha or in the text itself in its proper place.

This was probably the first attempt at the interpolation of this canto and was therefore confined only to a particular locality.

Let us next proceed to the Anugita parva. As the title indicates, it was conceived as a continuation of the Bhagavadgita, which we find in the sixth Book. The way in which it is introduced is interesting.

Arjuna complains to Krishna that he had almost entirely forgotten all that the Avatar had taught him through the Bhagavadgita discourses, and would very much like to hear a resume of it from the same fountain source of knowledge. Krishna very complacently starts another course of lectures. This is the genesis of the Anugitaparva.

In its case, however, we meet with the singular-circumstance that it is not noticed at all in the Parva-Sangraha.

How odd, how strange, that this continuation of the Bhagavadgita, this utterance of the Avatar, supplementing his previous discourse, should have gone into the text unnoticed and uncared for in the Parva-sangraha.

Here then is an instance of an interpolation put into the text and made to depend on the authority of a tampered note in the Preliminary enumeration and only that.

There is another fact to be regarded. It is clear from the enumeration that the Anugita-parva should appear as the second canto, that is, it should start only after the close of the Aswamedha canto. But that is not where we find it in the text of the Book. As usual we find it put into the middle of what should properly be the first canto. The Anugitaparva is made to start with chapter 17 (Dravida text) and the title is continued to the end of chapter 95, which really closes this Book in all editions other than the Dravida.

The first 16 chapters of this Book are entitled the 'Aswamedha Parva' but in them nothing relevant to the Aswamedha of Yudhishtira is narrated.

The chapters relating to the Aswamedha occur only towards the close of the Book. They are chapters 63, 64, 65, 71 to 90 and are made to pass in the postscripts as chapters of the Anugita parva. But the Anugita portion really extends only from chapters 17 to 50, so that it is not possible to find any excuse for continuing the title from chapter 51 onwards. And yet it was done. Why?

Why were the Aswamedha chapters put after the Anugita?

The first step with an interpolation is ordinarily to tack it on at the end of a Book or canto, with an introductory chapter by way of a connecting link. The next step is to advance it into the canto itself.

This may be gathered from the general arrangement of matter in the text of the Bharata. The Parva-sangraha for this Book gives the detail of its contents as follows:—

“Here is given the very excellent story of (Samvarta Maruttiya) संवर्तमरुत्तीय and the acquisition of gold; also the birth of परीक्षित्, Parikshit. (Miraculously restored to life by Krishna, after having been scalded in the mother’s womb by the Astra of Aswaththama). We have herein the wanderings of the sacrificial horse, under the care of Arjuna; his battles here and there with opposing princes, his contest of doubtful issue with his son Chitrangada and the story of Nakula at this great horse-sacrifice.”

Thus we find that the whole Book depended mostly on the Aswamedha, instead of, as we now find, the Aswamedha serving as a peg on which to hang sermons.

The संवर्तमरुत्तीयोपाख्यानम् Samvarta-maruttiyopakhyanam can well be spared without in any way marring the story of the Book. It has little or no connection with the Aswamedha of Yudhishtira. It is difficult to believe that this episode should have formed part of the original work.

The नकुलोपाख्यानम् Nakulopakhyanam, placed towards the close of the Book, appears to have been conceived as a statement of the argument of the Buddhists against animal sacrifices. But there is no indication in the text of its adoption by the learned Brhmins who assembled at Yudhishtira’s Aswamedha.

If नकुल Nakula had appeared earlier, to reason with the Brahmins against the sacrifice, before it started, it

would have been more to the purpose; but, in that event, there would have been no Aswamedha to be described.

This Nakula, therefore, with a high sense of propriety, keeps himself in his hole (Nakula=a mungoose) until the whole sacrifice is over and the guests have left. The Aswamedha sacrifice and the Book itself really close with chapter. 90.

Nakulopakhyanam is set out in chapters, 91 to 95, which are the final chapters of this Book. It is thus extremely probable that this episode was the result of an afterthought; the more so as the preaching of Nakula did not bear any fruit.

The Telugu translator’s Parva-Sangraha of this Book requires to be noticed. He renders faithfully the detail as given in the Sanskrit. He also does more. He adds in the notice అనుగీతము, బ్రాహ్మణగీతము, శురుశిష్యసంవాదంబును, (Anugita and some Sermon by a Brahmin and a dialogue between a Guru and his pupil) as chapters of this Book; the latter two he probably understood as being comprised in the 1st title.

But the Anugita is placed by him at the close of the Aswamedha and as the final canto of the Book.

It is certain that the interpolation had been effected before his time. It is probable that, as yet, the Anugita had not been advanced into the middle of the Aswamedha canto or, more precisely speaking, that it was not put above the true Aswamedha chapters.

We may be equally certain that, in the Parva-Sangraha that the Telugu author had before him, he found no mention of the Anugita. If that was so why did he



add it on in his Parva-sangraha? The reason can be suggested.

He probably found it in the Preliminary enumeration. He found it in the text in its proper place. He found that it was wanting in the Sangraha. He appears to have thought that it was an accidental omission.

He supplied what he thought was wanting. In view of the above discussion we may suggest:—

That the Vaishnava-dharma-Parva is a late interpolation; that the Anugita and Nakulopakhyanam are likewise interpolations. The same has also to be said of the Samvartamaruttiyam.

It looks as if the last named was the first in the order of the interpolations. The Anugita being the second and the Nakulopakhyanam, the third. There can be no doubt that the Vaishnavadharmaparva is the latest attempt at interpolations.

XV. The next Book is named Asrama-Vasaparva आश्रमवासपर्व. Residence in the Ashram. It is an important Book. It is the beginning of the end and starts the exit of the Dramatis Personae for bringing the narrative and the epic to a close.

This Book, in particular, records the passing away of old Dhritarashtra and his queen, of Kunti, of Vidura and of Sanjaya.

The old King wished to end his days in the solitude of the forest and, leaving the capital, proceeded to a hermitage in the sacred land of Kurukshetra. He was accompanied by the old queen and also by Kunti. The latter volunteered to give her help and service to the

blind old couple. Vidura and Sanjaya, the King's two faithful and life long adherents, also went with him.

The Preliminary enumeration indicates three cantoes for this Book. We find about the same number suggested by the Parva-sangraha. Even in this small Book we find evidence of the handiwork of the revisers of the text.

We find in the text that, sometime after the old folk got settled in the hermitage of Satayupa शतयूप or the hundred sacrificial posts, Yudhishtira went there to see them to pay his devoirs; that he stayed there for about a month; that, soon after he went there, he asked for Vidura; that seeing Vidura in the distance he walked out to meet Vidura; that when Yudhishtira approached Vidura the latter fell dead on the instant; that some radiant light issued out of the dead man's body and entered Yudhishtira's. We also find in the text that Vyasa turned up at the hermitage, suddenly. One day, the Rishi promised to give them all a vision of the dead. Dhritarashtra would see all his children and grandchildren. That he was blind did not matter. Kunti would see Karna and her grand-sons. Yudhishtira would see all whom he cared to see.

That night all the heroes slain in the war were seen, accordingly, in the vision conjured up by Vyasa.

Thereafter Yudhishtira and his party left for home.

Reading on, we find that, when the story of this scene was narrated by Vaisampayana to Janamejaya, the latter gave expression to his scepticism and declined

to believe the facts stated until Vyasa contrived a similar show for his own benefit; for, he wished to see his father Parikshit, the Rishi's son whom Parikshit insulted, and the Rishi who pronounced the curse on Parikshit, which brought about the fatal end of the King's life.

The Rishi Vyasa appeared as soon as Janamejaya thought of him, and was not offended at the scepticism betrayed by the latter, possibly because he was the ruling sovereign.

The vision asked for was granted. Janamejaya professed himself satisfied with the ghostly seance and pronounced his doubts resolved. Vaisampayana proceeded with the story.

I have given this summary to enable the reader to grasp readily what follows.

The advent of Yudhishtira to the forest-residence of Dhritarashtra and the elders is an after-thought. It is not even hinted at in the Parva-sangraha. The reason for this trip appears to be the anxiety of some interpolator, who wished to include Yudhishtira, among the party privileged to behold the dead re-appearing in the garb of life, in the show contrived by Vyasa.

The next thing to be regarded is the joke about Janamejaya's disbelief and his putting Vyasa to the test.

This incident likewise is not known to the Parva-sangraha.

There need be no doubt therefore but that the chapters connecting Yudhishtira with the incidents in

the Ashram of Satayupa, as well as the chapters about Janamejaya's scepticism and his putting Vyasa to the test, are interpolations.

There is one more fact to be observed in connection with this Book. We notice in the Parva-sangraha, as the last incident mentioned for this Book, that Yudhishtira met Narada and learnt from the Rishi all about the drunken brawl and the extermination of the Yadavas by mutual slaughter.

On referring to the text we find that Yudhishtira did meet Narada, but nothing about the Yadava catastrophe transpired between them. Narada is made to give only an account of the death in a forest conflagration of Dhritarashtra, Gandhari and Kunti. We look in vain for Narada's narrative of the Yadava slaughter. On the other hand, the Parva-sangraha makes no reference to Narada's report to Yudhishtira of the harrowing account of the death in the forest fire of the elders.

The chapter about the slaughter of the Yadavas has been cut out of this Book. We find it opening the next Book, *where, however, Narada does not appear.*

We thus find that, according to the Parva-sangraha,

1. The Pandavas learnt of the end of the Yadavas from Narada;

2. The account given by Narada formed the closing chapter of this Book *i.e.* the Asramavasika. *But we find in the texts as they stand,*

1. that the Pandavas came to know of the Yadava catastrophe only in the next Book;

2. and that the information reached the Pandavas from no definite source, but they seem to have been apprised of the event only by floating rumours.

This is very strange and not accounted for. Another feature is that Narada is brought in at the close of this Book, the Ashramavasa, but not for the purpose indicated by the Parva-sangraha. It is clear, therefore, that something known to the Parva-sangraha has been removed altogether and something not known to it introduced into the text, as has been proved to be the case so often.

We may take it that Yudhishtira's march to the forest to see the elders is an interpolation, that the vision of the dead is equally so, and that the revisers of the text have tampered with the closing chapters of the Book for reasons of their own.

## CHAPTER VI.

XVI. The next Book is the sixteenth, named Mausala Parva, dealing with the extermination of the Yadavas.

For some reason, not apparent, the source from which Yudhishtira got the information is not stated. It was certainly not from Narada. It appears to have been obtained from mere gossiping talk in the neighbourhood.

It is not clear from the Parva-sangraha whether the Avatars, Balarama and Krishna, perished in the free fight of the drunken Yadavas, who broke the heads or cut the throats, each of the other.

*In the text*, however, the Avatars were separated from the rest of the crowd and made to look on while the slaughter was taking place. They merely looked on because they did not wish to, and perhaps could not, arrest the course of destiny.

But the call was come for them also. Bala, the elder, changed himself into a serpent and crawled out into the sea. We are told that he left his mortal body behind. Krishna lay down under a tree. A hunter from the distance mistook him for some game and shot at him. The arrow struck the mark and proved fatal.

Gods and angels were in attendance, and the Avatar, assuming his proper divine form, went up to heaven in a chariot. The earthly form of the Avatar lay on the earth.

It is surprising that the Parva-sangraha makes no mention of the end, as narrated in the text, of Bala and Krishna. We are told in the Parva-sangraha that, when Arjuna went over to Dwaraka, he first saw to the cremation of his maternal uncle, the father of the Avatar, and then went to the sea-side and there observed the great carnage and slaughter in and about the tavern. He had the bodies of Bala and Krishna cremated as also the remains of the principal Yadava dead.

This gives no indication whatever that the Avatars were not slaughtered at the tavern. The suggestion in the Parva-sangraha is perhaps to the effect that they lost their lives along with the others.

We read in the text that Krishna, when he lay down under the tree, never to rise again in his mortal

form, sent his charioteer to speed to Hastinapuram to report to the Pandavas the news of the extermination of the Yadavas and to request Arjuna to go over to Dwaraka and take good care of the survivors.

The charioteer Daruka went accordingly and reported to the Pandavas.

This matter requires close examination. In the first chapter of this Book (XVIth), we are told that Yudhishtira learnt that the Yadavas exterminated themselves by killing each other. According to the report heard by him, Bala and Krishna were also killed at the same time and the information does not appear to have given them a different termination than it gave to the other Yadavas.

Yudhishtira and his brother made some difficulty in believing that Bala and Krishna should have met with such an ignominious end. But that was the report for aught they knew. If then, the events, as they transpired at Dwaraka, were known at Hastinapuram before Daruka the charioteer went there, what time had elapsed after the slaughter of the Yadavas?

When this messenger left Dwaraka, Krishna and Bala were alive, and Daruka had no knowledge that they gave up the ghost, subsequently. Let us turn to the chapter in which he delivers his message. This is compressed into one line, the half of an Anushtubh.

(दारुकोपि कुरुन् गत्वा दृष्ट्वा पार्थान् महारथान्)

आचष्ट मौसले वृष्णीनन्योन्येनोपसंहृतान्

He stated that the Yadavas killed each other. This was the sum total of his message. He did not tell the

Pandavas that Krishna and Bala died or were killed or that they survived the disaster, and yet he did not know that they passed away.

It is surprising that every one appeared to have understood that the two divine personages were also among the departed, and that they associated their death with the drunken affray.

In the text we find that, on going to Dwaraka, Arjuna found his maternal uncle well, and that the said uncle died or gave up the ghost later.

The Parva-Sangraha also records that, on his way back from Dwaraka, escorting the survivors, mostly women, from there to Hastinapuram, Arjuna had a hard time of it on account of a raid by thieves and bandits; that he then discovered that his right hand had lost its cunning and that his skill in archery had disappeared. He was then advised by Vyasa to turn Sannyasin, and on his return home, *he did so*.

*In the text we do not find that Arjuna passed into the order of Sannyasins.* The fact recorded in the Parva-Sangraha has been altered and, as will appear lower down, with a purpose. The idea of asceticism appears to have been abandoned, for Vyasa tells Arjuna to await his approaching end.

The suggestion in the Parva-Sangraha is that Vasudeva (the father of Krishna) perished with the multitude and the first act of Arjun in Dwaraka as noted in the Parva-Sangraha was the cremation of Vasudeva.

This is all changed in the text, where we find that Vasudeva was alive when Arjuna went there, and uncle

and nephew had a long talk about the great misfortune—and sometime later Vasudeva passed away.

The Parva-Sangraha does not mention Daruka's mission to Hastinapuram and yet why was this developed in the text?

Let us reflect a little. Daruka set out after the slaughter was over. Dwaraka is placed on the coast of Guzerat. Hastinapuram is supposed to have been some-where about the modern Delhi, if it was not in trans-Himalayan regions.

Daruka travelled in a chariot in use in the ancient period. What time did he take to reach Hastinapuram? What time did Arjuna take to go from Hastinapuram to Dwaraka? Did the corpses of the drunken Yadavas, exposed on the sea-side in the tropical climate, lie all this time without rot, so as to be individually recognisable when Arjuna turned up there?

We will pass on to another matter. We find in the text that Arjuna removed all the women and the survivors from Dwaraka to his own District in the north. The townsmen were advised to leave Dwaraka, seasonably, as the time was come when the city would be engulfed in the waters of the sea by the encroachment of that element. As the party marched out, the waters of the sea gradually surged up and, when the rearguard passed out, the last dry bit of the city disappeared under the flood. This incident so important and so well-known, traditionally, is not stated in the Parva-Sangraha.

It is not possible, therefore, to vouch for the genuineness of this portion of the text.

There are other matters which would be more in point in a critical study of the *text*.

It is very probable that, in the first instance, the outline of what is now the Mausala Parva, confined to the more important facts, was compressed into a chapter and that the same was placed at the end of the Asramavasikaparva. It is probable that with the religious motive of expanding the text of the Bharata into 18 Books, the revision of the Bharata as it then stood was undertaken at some unknown period. It is probable that in this period the last chapter of what is now the Asrama-Vasika-Parva was removed from that Book, re-written in an expanded form and put into the text as Mausala Parva or the present Book. Under such circumstances, it is conceivable that new ideas should have been worked out and that some circumspection should have been wanting.

The revisers appear to have taken advantage of the opportunity to give a more decent form of exit in the case of Bala and Krishna, the Avatars, than what is suggested in the Parvasangraha.

It is also apparent that the Mausala Parva, after its first debut, has itself undergone repeated revision, and this even subsequent to the redaction of the Parvasangraha.

XVII. The next Book is the 17th, Mahaprasthanikam महाप्रस्थानिकम्, that is the great Exodus. It was a long journey on which the Pandavas with their common wife set out, never to return. It was a journey towards eternity and immortality. They started walking in single file. Precedence on the march was kept up in

the order of seniority. Draupadi came up last in the line. Behind her a dog trudged along bringing up the rear.

This dog comes on the scene for the first time here. He was not mentioned before this. This is conceivable. For this dog is no other than Anubis who conducted the Souls of the dead into Hades.

But the point is that the Parvasangraha makes no mention of the dog in connection with this journey of the Pandavas. He has, however, been introduced into the text.

The Pandavas proceeded eastwards until they reached the sea. Then they marched southwards along the coast line.

From the extreme south they marched north-west up to the submerged site of Dwaraka and then proceeded straight north. They crossed the Himalayas and passed through a desert region.

Then they marched onwards until they saw in the distance the towering summits of Mount Meru.

Onwards they pressed, when Draupadi dropped down first and the spirit left her body. The rest passed on unmoved. The four brothers dropped down in order of juniority, Sahadeva, Nakula, Arjuna and Bhima. Unmoved Yudhishtira pressed on with the faithful dog as his only companion.

The detail of the *Parva-sangraha* for this Book ends with the statement that Yudhishtira pressed on heedless of the death of the other Pandavas.

But, if we look into the text of this Book, we find an additional chapter included in it, which however is stated in the *Parva-sangraha* for the next Book, that is the last and the eighteenth.

This additional chapter records that Indra came down in his chariot and asked Yudhishtira to get into it, so that he might go up in the flesh to heaven.

Yudhishtira was willing, if Indra would allow the dog also to go in. This was objected to, as the dog was entitled to no place there. But Yudhishtira stood firm and declined the honour offered to him, if he could not share it with his faithful attendant.

All at once, the dog changed by metamorphosis into a god. The dog disappeared and Pluto stood revealed in his place.

The other gods who were watching the scene from above admired the moral courage of Yudhishtira and his faithful attachment even to the brute beast. There was now no difficulty. Yudhishtira stepped into the car which flew up at once into the skies, trailing in its course a stream of effulgence that lit up the higher regions as far as the eye could reach.

Yudhishtira was taken to Swarga. We find all this in the text as the 3rd chapter of the 17th Book. But according to the *Parva-sangraha* it should go into the 18th Book. Why this alteration was made is not clear.

XVIII. We now pass on to the 18th and the last Book of the epic.

We find that the *Parvasangraha* for this Book gives, as for the first chapter of it, an adequate summary of the contents of what is now the 3rd chapter of the 17th Book.

The Parva-sangraha also gives some notice of what we find in chapters 2 and 3 of the 18th Book.

So that the two do not accord, the Parva-sangraha and the text.

The first chapter of the 18th Book as we now find it involves an idea for which there is no countenance in the Parva-sangraha and on which the compilers cannot be complimented.

Yudhishtira sees Duryodhana in great splendour in Swarga. He is moved to envy and rails at the gods for their want of good sense in raising a wicked man like Duryodhana to a place of equality with himself. He pours forth abuse on Duryodhana, and tells the Gods straightway that he would not care for Swarga if he had to live there with Dhuryodhana for his neighbour.

This was overdoing it and there is no doubt that this idea was a late interpolation.

Yudhishtira, subsequently, bathed in the celestial Ganges, as the result of which 'he shuffled off his mortal coil' and was invested, like the gods, with a body of light and lived on with the rest of the gods there.

The last chapter records the formal closing of the great work. Janamejaya dismisses Astika and the Rishis with costly presents, and removes himself from Takshasila, (Taxila) where he was staying for the sacrifice, to his capital Hastinapuram.

An additional chapter, giving, in detail, the method of reading the Bharata religiously and the

advantages, spiritual and temporal, flowing from such study, is excerpted from the Harivamsa.

With respect to the last two Books, there is reason to believe that they were re-written at a very late period. We may verify this by looking at the Telugu author's Parva-sangraha and comparing it with the Sanskrit.

We find from the Telugu Parva-sangraha of the 17th Book that the five Pandavas with their common wife passed away to Eternity - in that Book.

They are all spoken of together, and the word used to indicate their passage from this world to the other is the same. No distinction is made between Yudhishtira of the one part and the rest of them of the other.

No indication that Yudhishtira survived them or that he was met by Indra; no intimation of the dog; no suggestion that Yudhishtira was invited and privileged to go up in the flesh to Heaven.

The Telugu author's, rendering of the Parva-sangraha of the 18th Book throws considerable light on the matter:—

"The account of Karna in Hell. His release from there. The meeting of the Bharata heroes, one with another in Swarga; and the great eminence attained by them, severally, there, according to individual merits. These are the matters dealt with in the 18th Book".

This is what we have in the Telugu Parva-sangraha. The reader will be surprised to find that this summary of the Telugu author has nothing in common

with the detail of the Sangraha in Sanskrit, and, again, it does not correspond with the actual contents of the text of this Book.

There is not one word in the Sanskrit parva-sangraha about Karna. In the text Karna is no doubt mentioned as occupying a high seat, resplendent with celestial light, in company with the others of the heroes. But there is nothing in the text about his confinement in Hell or his release therefrom.

There is some by-play however. A show is contrived in a realistic way of the region of Hell, stinking with the smell of carrion, and Yudhishtira is made to believe that he is in the midst of that region. He imagines that he hears some familiar voices and, on his questioning, he hears a reply that they are the voices of Karna, of Yudhishtira's brothers, and of Draupadi.

We should note that up to the detail of the 16th Book, inclusive, the Telugu author had followed the Sanskrit sangraha-original closely. That being so, there was no reason for him to strike out a new line on his own initiative in the matter of the last two Books. He had no motive to do so and no purpose to serve. He would not have been justified in making a departure and putting in entirely new matter. The extent of variation is great and, at least, in one particular, vital.

Can it be said that, if the Parva-sangraha translated by the Telugu author contained a statement that Yudhishtira was taken up in his mortal body to Swarga, he should have taken it on himself to suppress it. It was a fact to which especial prominence should have been and would have been accorded. It was a distinction

achieved by no other, amongst the hundreds of the heroes, in that exceptionally heroic age. Not Bhishma nor Drona had that privilege. The very Avatars, Bala and Krishna, left their mortal bodies behind. Is it conceivable that the Brahmin author should have suppressed this incident and substituted in its stead the common place termination of ordinary human beings?

We have only to write, side by side, the detail in the Sanskrit and the Telugu to be convinced, without further argument, that these two Books were entirely recast.

**Telugu Parva-Sangraha**  
of the 17th Book.

"And then the installation of Parikshit as king; the passage of the *five Pandavas and Draupadi to eternity*, (పరమార్థి) after giving up their kingdom". "These are the contents of the 17th Book, which reckons 120 verses, and is named Mahaprasthanikam".

**Sanskrit Parva-Sangraha**  
of the 17th Book.

"The next is the 17th Book, named Mahaprasthanikam, in which the Pandavas forsake their Kingdom and with Draupadi set out on the great journey.

They meet Agni on the margin of the Lauhitya ocean and there, at the suggestion of Agni, Arjuna gives up to him the great bow named Gandivam: Yudhishtira, seeing his brothers and Draupadi drop down, *proceeds on his march without heeding*.

This is the 17th Book named Mahaprasthanikam,



This Book comprises 3 chapters *and 320 verses*, as computed by the *seer of truth* (Vyasa).

**Telugu** Parva-Sangraha  
of the 18th Book.

"And then Karna's imprisonment in Hell and his release, the intermingling of the Bharata warriors in Swarga, and the enjoyment by them of the fruits of Karma. These are the contents of the 18th Book, named Swargárohanam, which reckons 200 verses."

**Sanskrit** Parva-sangraha  
of the 18th Book.

"The next Book is known as Swarga Parva. The divine and super-human chariot was let down for Yudhishtira from Swarga. But he did not care to go into it except in company with his dog. Seeing his righteous stand in the matter, Dharma revealed himself in his true form giving up that of the dog, and Yudhishtira went to Swarga. ....and an angel showed to him by a trick the semblance of Naraka or Hell. The righteous one then heard plaintive cries of his brothers as though they were hard by and in (prison) discipline.

"Then, as advised by Dharma, Yudhishtira bathed in the celestial Ganges; and, giving up his mortal body, took his proper place in Swarga, that to which he was entitled by his virtues. There he rejoiced respected by all-the Indras, and the hosts of the angels."

The 2nd chapter of the First Book, the 2nd of the preliminary chapters which we have been studying, is now drawing to a close; and we have a description, in glowing language, of the religious merit of a study of the Bharata and a description of its literary merits as well.

We are told that if all the four Vedas together with the Upanishads belonging to them had been carefully studied, and yet the Bharata had not been studied, then the eyes of the Vedic scholar have not been opened.

Some remarks in these closing verses have to be regarded with attention. इतिहासोत्तमादस्माज्जायन्तेकविबुद्धयः 'Poets draw their inspiration from this best of Itihasas.' इदमकवि वरेस्सर्वैराख्यानमुपजीव्यते. 'The poets all depend on this story for their existence.'

This is quite conceivable; but, at the same time, it must be conceded that a considerable period should have elapsed before the poets of later ages could turn to the Bharata for topics and themes to be woven into poems and dramas.

The Bharata may have supplied to the poets of India the place occupied by the Gesta Romanorum for the Elizabethan poets. But before it attained that position considerable time must have elapsed, and meanwhile the text must have been widely distributed, in ages when it was not easy to multiply copies; and yet, this is the pronouncement of the Sauti who is reciting it without the help of a manuscript.

'There is no tale or story current in the world that is not to be found here'.

This may be true. But this can be due only to the one or the other of two circumstances; either by reason that all available stories had been passed into it, or because they got abroad by dissemination from the Bharata.

But where was the justification for putting into the Bharata, designed as a story of the war between the Kurus and the Pandus, all the available tales and fables current in the land?

If the tales were for the first time started in the Bharata, the invention must have been an extensive one, and quite beyond the original programme; so extensive and revolutionary in character as to throw the main theme of the epic completely into the background.

Was it probable that the Bharata should have seen the light for the first time in its present form?

Again, if the tales were really started by the Bharata and were sown broadcast throughout the land, what time had elapsed between the recital by Vaisampayana and the period when the upakhyānam were the common knowledge of the peoples of India? And yet, this was the pronouncement of the Sauti, a contemporary of Vaisampayana.

It is clear that this 2nd chapter, like the first, was a late composition prefaced to the redacted version of the Bharata, after the last but one(?) revision of the text, at a time when that revision was contemplated as the final one.

These two chapters are put into the mouth of the Sauti, a circumstance, which, instead of leading

to the result hoped for by the revisers, has led to the opposite one of betraying the handiwork of the interpolator.

We have not quite done with this second chapter yet. We have to examine it further for another connected purpose which will appear in the notes following hereafter.

---

## BOOK. IV.

### CHAPTER I.

For the better appreciation of what follows it is desirable that the scheme of the Parva-Sangraha should be described in brief.

The Parva-Sangraha or summary of the contents of each of the 18th Books follows the Parvanukramanika or Preliminary enumeration of 'the cantoes in sequence'. The confusion arising from the use of the identical word Parva in the original both for 'canto' and for 'Book' should be avoided.

The Parvasangraha for the 1st Book started with an enumeration of the canto titles comprised in the first Book or assigned to it. It is much to be regretted that this idea was not worked out in the case of the other Books, though it is not difficult to see how the cantoes have been apportioned among the other Books.

It is probable that the scheme disclosed in the summary of the first Book, in enumerating the cantoes comprised in that Book, was developed throughout, but that the information was suppressed by later revisers.

The probability is heightened by the fact that the Telugu translator gives in his Sangraha the cantoes allocated to each Book.

Barring this difference, that the Sangraha of the 1st Book names the cantoes appropriated to it and the Sangraha of the other Books does not, the course of the Parva Sangraha is throughout uniform.

The Sangraha of each Book starts with its name. Then, a summary, in more or less detail, is given of the contents of the text of the Book; then the name of the Book is repeated, the number of chapters and the number of Slokas (verses) in the Book is given, and a sort of colophon is also supplied that the reckoning of the Verses and the Adhyayas was made by Vyasa or that the Verses were spoken or uttered by him, thus suggesting his authorship.

*In the case of some Books this Verification is wanting. In the case of some other Books it is not clear*

Let us proceed :—

The Parva Sangraha, as stated above, gives in the case of each Book the number of Adhyayas or chapters into which it was divided and the total number of Slokas for that particular Book.

It is clear that, when this tale of chapters and Slokas was inserted, the text must have been previously revised; and the redactors would appear to have believed that they succeeded in settling the text for ever, and did not wish that it should be further tampered with.

They did not wish to allow to others the liberty that they had arrogated to themselves.

They thought that the best way of preventing further interference with the text was to count the number of verses and Adhyayas and to give the text their imprimatur that way. This was done to supply the necessary canonical authority.

But this trick, however, did not stand in the way of Bharata Specialists of a later generation who laboured on the same lines.

We accordingly find that, subsequent to the redaction disclosed in the Parva-Sangraha, the number of chapters increased in almost every one of the larger Books, and the count of verses has also as a consequence changed. Whole cantoes have been re-written and re-arranged, as suited the ideas of later compilers; individual chapters have been split up or clubbed together, as was considered expedient. The minor Books have been re-written and even the Parva Sangraha itself has been tampered with.

Added to this, we find that new matter has largely been interpolated and no two texts quite agree in every particular. I should also refer to the light thrown on these items of information by the work of the Telugu author.

He gives, after the Telugu summary of the contents of each Book of the Sanskrit original, as given in the Sanskrit Parva-sangraha, *the number of cantoes of that Book* and the number of Slokas also.

It is much to be regretted that he did not reproduce the number of chapters of each Book.

The most valuable portion of the detail recorded by him is, for our present purpose, the number of Slokas as stated by him.

I propose to take the reader through the figures to justify the observations made above, to demonstrate the divergence as between the existing texts of each from the other, and the surprising variations from the totals of the original redaction, disclosed by the existing texts, as also, the divergence between the figures of the 2nd chapter of the Sanskrit Bharata and the figures transcribed by the Telugu author.

Serial number of the Books.	Number of Antah-Parvas, as appearing from the Telugu Parva-sangraha.	Number of Adhyayas as given in the Sanskrit Parva-sangraha.	Number of Adhyayas, as found in the text of the Calcutta Copy.	Number of Adhyayas, as found in the text of the Bombay Edition.	Number of Adhyayas, as found in the text of the Dravida copy.	Number of Slokas, as given in the Sanskrit Parva-sangraha.	Number of Slokas, as given in the Telugu Parva-sangraha.	Actual No. of Slokas found to exist in the Calcutta Copy.	Actual No. of Slokas found to exist in the Bombay Copy.	Actual No. of Slokas found to exist in the Dravida Copy.	Names of the Books.
1	18	227	236	234	260	8884	9984	8476	8529	11081	Adi Parva.
2	9	78	80	81	103	2511	4311	2695	2709	4866	Sabha Parva.
3	16	269	314	315	315	11664	13664	11801	11642	12172	Vana P. or Aranya
4	4	67	72	72	78	2050	3500	2295	2258	3494	Virata Parva.
5	11	186	197	196	196	6698	6998	6621	6604	6716	Udyoga Parva.
6	5	117	124	122	122	5884	5884	5715	5870	5896	Bhisma Parva.
7	8	170	204	202	208	8909	10919	9509	9544	9973	Drona Parva.
8	1	69	96	96	101	4964	4900	4799	4896	4985	Karna Parva.
9	4	59	96	96	101	3220	3220	3497	3596	3594	Saiva Parva.
10	3	18	18	18	18	870	2874	748	803	815	Sautila Parva
11	5	27	27	27	27	775	1775	803	821	807	Suri Parva.
12	4	339	365	365	375	14732	14525	13625	13485	15126	Santi Parva.
13	2	146	168	168	174	8000	12000	7637	7680	11151	Anusasana Parva.
14	2	103	92	92	118	3320	4420	2849	2825	4524	Asvamedha Parva.
15	3	42	39	39	41	1506	1106	1081	1051	1068	Asramavastika P.
16	1	8	8	8	9	330	300	288	287	301	Mausala Parva.
17	1	3	3	3	3	320	120	109	110	111	Mahaprasanthika P.
18	1	5	6	5	5	209	200	211	215	337	Swargarohana P.
98	1933	2114	2108	2314	84836	100700	82759	82575	96517		
Haivansa 1											
Bhavisya 1											
Parva 1	100										

The reader may see from the foregoing statement that, except in the case of the 10th Book (18 chapters), the 11th (27 chapters), the 16th (8 chapters), the 17th (3 chapters) and the 18th (5 chapters), in none of the other Books do we find the number of chapters according with the figures in the Parva-Sangraha. And, as regards the total number of Slokas of each Book, there is no agreement, even in a single instance, between the actual number of Slokas now found in either of the texts compared and the figures given in the Parva-Sangraha.

How then did these differences come about? Who took the liberty of adding to the number of chapters? Why did they do it? How did the number of Slokas increase as in the Dravida text by 11580. (Eleven thousands five hundred and eighty.) over and above the number stated in the redacted Parva-Sangraha?

These questions will probably be never answered satisfactorily. But they point their own moral.

We have next to regard the difference in the figures of the actuals of the Calcutta and the Dravida texts. The difference is large.

The Calcutta text is probably nearer the redacted form. The greatest activity in interpolation, in post-redaction periods, seems to have had its nursing ground in Southern India. This may appear strange but must be accepted as correct.

But by far the most important fact to be faced is that the figures for the Slokas, as given by the Telugu author, show a great variation from the

figures we now find in the text of the second chapter. How is this to be explained? We may conceive of two situations:—one, that he took the figures, as in the ordinary course he should have done, from the Sanskrit Parva-Sangraha translated by him. If that was so, it is quite clear that the text of the Parva-Sangraha, which he had before him, contained figures quite different from those which we now read in the Parva-Sangraha before us. What became of that Parva-Sangraha? How did it happen to record figures varying from those now common to both the northern and the southern texts, as set out in the 2nd chapters.

It was stated above that the scheme of the Parva-Sangraha included a sort of colophon, at the end of the summary of most of the Parvas, verifying the authorship of the Books by Vyasa.

I. With respect to the first Book, we have this information:—

इत्येतदादिपर्वोक्तम् प्रथमम् बहुविस्तरम्  
अध्यायानाम् शते द्वे तु संख्याताः परमर्षिणा  
सप्तविंशतिरध्यायाः व्यासेनोत्तमतेजसा  
अष्टौ श्लोकसहस्राणि अष्टौ श्लोकशतानि च  
श्लोकाश्च चतुरशीतिर्मुनिनोक्ता महात्मना

‘And this, the (First Book) Adiparva, very extensive, has been told—200 chapters were reckoned by the great Rishi; also 27 chapters, by Vyasa of Supreme effulgence. 8 thousands of verses and 8 hundreds and 84 were uttered by the high-minded Muni’.

II. The entry for the 2nd Book runs thus:—

एतत्सर्वम् सभापर्वं समाख्यातम् महात्मना  
अध्यायाःसप्ततिर्ज्ञेया स्थाचाष्टौ प्रसंख्यया  
श्लोकानाम् द्वे सहस्रेतु पञ्च श्लोकशतानिच  
श्लोकाश्चैकादश ज्ञेयाः पर्वण्यस्मिन् द्विजोत्तमाः

‘And this, the Sabha Parva, was told by the high-souled one. Of Slokas, you should know in this Book 2 thousands, 5 hundreds, and 11.’

III. The note for the 3rd Book is as follows:—

एतदारण्यकम् पर्वं तृतीयम् परिकीर्तितम्  
अत्राध्ययशते द्वे संख्यया परिकीर्तिते  
एकोनसप्ततिश्चैव तथाध्यायाः प्रकीर्तिताः  
एकादशसहस्राणि श्लोकानाम् षट्शतानिच  
चतुष्पष्टिस्तथा श्लोकाः पर्वण्यस्मिन् प्रकीर्तिताः

‘This, the 3rd Book, is designated Aranyakam. And in this are numbered two hundreds of chapters, also sixty nine more chapters. Of Slokas, the number is 11 thousands, also 6 hundreds, and 64.’

*The reader will note that there is no reference to Vyasa here.*

IV. Next about the Fourth Book:—

चतुर्थमेतद्विपुलम् वैराटम् पर्वं वर्णितम्  
अत्रापि परिसंख्याता अध्यायाः परमर्षिणा  
सप्तषष्टिरथोपूर्णा श्लोकानामपि मे शृणु  
श्लोकानाम् द्वेसहस्रेतु श्लोकाः पञ्चाशदेवतु  
उक्तानि वेदविदुषा पर्वण्यस्मिन् महर्षिणा

6. ‘This large Book, the Fourth, named Vairatam, has been described. And herein were numbered by

the great Rishi, 67 chapters. • I shall give also the count of the Slokas, listen please. 2 thousands and 50 Slokas were spoken by the great Rishi, the learned in the Vedas’.

V. The record for the Fifth Book is to this effect.

एतत् सुबहुवृत्तान्तम् पञ्चमम् पर्वं भारते  
उद्योगपर्वं निर्दिष्टम् सन्धिविग्रहमिश्रितम्  
अध्यायानाम् शतम् प्रोक्तम् षडशीति महर्षिणा  
श्लोकानाम् षट् सहस्राणि तावन्त्येव शतानिच  
श्लोकाश्च नवतिःप्रोक्ताः तथैवाष्टौ महात्मना  
व्यासेनोदारमतिना पर्वण्यस्मिन्स्तपोधनाः

‘This is the Fifth Book in the Bharata containing many matters of narration.

‘It is styled Udyogaparva and deals with attempts at peace and war.

‘Of chapters, 186 have been told by the great Rishi; of Slokas, 6 thousands, 6 hundreds and 98 have been spoken by the great one, Vyasa the high-souled one’.

VI. The Sixth Book has this note:—

षष्ठमम् तत् समाख्यातम् भारते पर्वं विस्तृतम्  
अध्यायानाम् शतम् प्रोक्तम् तथा सप्तदशापरे  
पञ्च श्लोकसहस्राणि संख्ययाष्टौ शतानिच  
श्लोकाश्च चतुरशीति रस्मिन् पर्वणि कीर्तिताः  
व्यासेन वेदविदुषा संख्याता भीष्मपर्वणि

‘This elaborate Book is the Sixth in the Bharata. Of chapters, 117 have been told. Of Slokas, by

number, 5 thousands 8 hundreds and 84 were sung in this Book, the Bhishma Parva, by Vyasa learned in the Vedas, and reckoned by him'.

VII The note as to the Seventh Book runs thus :—

अत्राध्यायशतम् प्रोक्तम् तथाध्यायाश्च सप्ततिः  
अष्टौ श्लोकसहस्राणि तथा नवशतानिच  
श्लोका नव तथैवात्र संख्यता स्तत्त्वदर्शिना  
पाराशर्येण मुनिना सञ्चित्य द्रोणपर्वणि

'And herein the chapters as numbered are one hundred-and seventy; also 8 thousands of Slokas and 9 hundreds and 9 were reckoned by the Knower of Truth, the Muni, son of Parasara, in this the Drona Parva'.

VIII The note to the Eighth Book requires particular attention.

अष्टमम् पर्व निर्दिष्टमेतद्भारतचिन्तकैः  
एकोनसप्ततिःप्रोक्ताः अध्यायाः कर्णपर्वणि  
चत्वार्येवसहस्राणि नव श्लोकशतानिच  
चतुष्पष्टिस्तथाश्लोकाः पर्वण्यस्मिन् प्रकीर्तिताः

'This Book is stated as the Eighth by those who have bestowed thought on the Bharata, i. e. (Bharata specialists). 69 chapters are told in the Karna Parva; 4 thousands and 9 hundreds and 64 Slokas are recorded in this Parva'.

There are two points to be regarded here.

The one is that there is no mention of Vyasa as the author of this Book. The other point is that we are

introduced to the Bharata specialists. We will revert to this matter, again.

Let us proceed.

IX. The ninth Book has this note.

नवमम् पर्व निर्दिष्टमेतद्भुतमर्थवत्  
एकोनषष्टिरध्यायाः पर्वण्यस्मिन् प्रकीर्तिताः  
संख्याता बहुवृत्तान्ताः श्लोकसंख्यात्रकथ्यते  
त्रीणि श्लोकसहस्राणि द्वे शते विंशति स्तथा  
मुनिना संप्रणीतानि कौरवाणाम् यशोभृता

'This Book is denominated the Ninth; it is full of meaning and is wonderful. There are 59 chapters comprised in it, full of many incidents. The count of the Slokas will now be given.

3 thousands of verses, 2 hundreds and a score more were composed by the Muni who was the repository of the fame of the Kauravas'.

X. For the Tenth Book we have this entry.

एतद्वै दशमम् पर्व सौप्तिकम् समुदाहृतम्  
अष्टादशास्मिन्नध्यायाः पर्वण्यस्मिन् महात्मना  
श्लोकानाम् कथितान्यत्र शतान्यष्टौ प्रसंख्यया  
श्लोकाश्च सप्ततिःप्रोक्ता मुनिना ब्रह्मवादिना  
सौप्तिकैषीकसंबद्धे पर्वण्युत्तमतेजसा

This then is the Tenth Book, mentioned as Sauptikam; 18 chapters have been told in this Book by the great one. 8 hundreds of verses and 70 have been told by the Muni, who is learned in the Vedas (in this Book in which Sauptika and Aishika are joined), the Muni of unsurpassed effulgence'.

XI. The note to the Eleventh Book requires close attention.

.....एतदिह प्रोक्तम् व्यासेन परमर्षिणा  
सप्तविंशतिरध्यायाः पर्वण्यस्मिन् प्रकीर्तिताः  
श्लोकसप्तशतीचापि पञ्चसप्ततिसंयुता  
संख्यया भारताख्यानमुक्तम् व्यासेन धीमता

.....“This was told by Vyasa, the great Rishi. 27 chapters have been sung herein; also 7 hundreds of verses plus 75. By count, the Bharata story was told by Vyasa, the wise one.”

XII. The note for the Twelfth Book runs thus :—

द्वादशम् पर्व निर्दिष्टमेतत् प्राज्ञजनप्रियम्  
अत्र पर्वणि विज्ञेयमध्यायानाम् शतत्रयम्  
त्रिंशच्चैव तथाध्यायाः नवचैव तपोधनाः  
चतुर्दशसहस्राणि तथा सप्तशतानिच  
सप्त श्लोकास्तथैवात्र पञ्चविंशतिसंख्यया

‘This Book is indicated as the Twelfth, pleasing to wise men. Ye holy men, you should know that the number of chapters in this Book is three hundreds and thirty and nine. 14 thousands of Slokas, and 7 hundreds and 7 and 25.’

This is all the reference that we have in respect of this Book. It is clear that there is no mention of Vyasa's authorship.

XIII. And next as to the Thirteenth Book :—

एतत्त्रयोदशम् पर्व धर्मनिश्चयकारकम्  
अध्यायानाम् शतन्वत् षट्त्वारिंशदेवतु  
श्लोकानान्तु सहस्राणि प्रोक्तान्यष्टौ प्रसंख्यया

This is the Thirteenth Book, determining questions of Dharma-Of chapters, 164 have been given and of Slokas, 8 thousands’.

Here also there is no reference to Vyasa at all.

XIV. We have this note to the Fourteenth Book :—

इत्याश्वमेधिकम् पर्व प्रोक्तमेतद्गहाद्भुतम्  
अध्यायानाम् शतञ्चैव त्रयोध्यायाश्च कीर्तिताः  
त्रीणि श्लोकसहस्राणि तावन्त्येव शतानिच  
विंशतिश्च तथा श्लोकास्संख्यातास्तत्त्वदर्शिना

“And this Book, the Aswamedhika, a very wonderful one, has been told. 103 chapters have been sung. 3 thousands of Slokas and as many hundreds (3) and 30 in addition, were counted by the *Knower of Truth*.” The reader is requested to note this expression “*Knower of Truth*.” It is a new idea and a convenient one. It is re-produced in the case of the next three Books.

There is no reason to suppose that this knower of truth was Vyasa. If that was meant the reference might have been made more explicit.

XV. As regards the Fifteenth Book, the note tells us :—

एतदाश्रमवासाख्यम् पर्वोक्तिम् सुमहाद्भुतम्  
द्विचत्वारिंशदध्यायाः पर्वैतदभिसंख्यया  
सहस्रमेकम् श्लोकानाम् पञ्च श्लोकशतानिच  
षडेवच तथाश्लोकास्संख्यातास्तत्त्वदर्शिना

‘This Book, a truly wonderful one, named Asramavasikam is thus told. This Book comprises 42



chapters. 1,000 Slokas and 5 hundreds and 6 have been totalled by the *Knower of Truth*.'

Here again we have the *Knower of Truth*.

XVI. The note about the Sixteenth Book runs thus:—

इत्येतन्मौसलम् पर्व षोडशम् परिकीर्तितम्  
अध्यायाष्टौ समाख्याताः श्लोकानां च शतत्रयम्  
श्लोकानाम् विंशतिश्चैव संख्यातास्तत्त्वदर्शिना

'Here then is the Sixteenth Book described. 8 chapters are narrated; 320 Slokas were computed by the *'Knower of Truth*.'

XVII. The next Book, the Seventeenth has this note.

एतत् सप्तदशम् पर्व महाप्रस्थानिकम् स्मृतम्  
यत्राध्यायास्त्रयः प्रोक्ताः श्लोकानां च शतत्रयम्  
विंशतिश्च तथा श्लोकास्संख्यातास्तत्त्वदर्शिना

'This is the 17th Book, named Mahaprasthanikam. In which 3 chapters are told and of Slokas 320 were reckoned by the *'Knower of Truth*.'

XVIII. We have come to the last Book, the Eighteenth. The note is to this effect.

एतदष्टादशम् पर्व प्रोक्तम् व्यासेन धीमता  
अध्यायाः पञ्चसंख्याताः पर्वण्यस्मिन् महात्मना  
श्लोकानाम् द्वेशतेचैव प्रसंख्याते तपोधनाः  
नव श्लोकास्तथैवान्ये संख्याताः परमार्षिणा

'This, the 18th Parva, was spoken by Vyasa, the wise one. 5 chapters were reckoned in this Book

by the high-souled one. Of Slokas 2 hundreds and 9 were numbered by the great Rishi'.

The abstract of the 'Colophons' is thus closed. We can go back now for a resurvey of the ground covered.

We find that, in the case of the undermentioned Books, the authorship of Vyasa is expressly mentioned, viz., I, V, VI, VII, XI, XVIII.

In the case of the following, the reference is sufficiently explicit to imply Vyasa. Books II, IV, IX, X. In the case of Books XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, no particular author is referred to. The mention of a तत्त्वदर्शी cannot be accepted as intended to refer to Vyasa; there is nothing else to recall his identity. *With respect to Books III, VIII, XII, and XIII, there is no reference to Vyasa or to any author.* The 3rd Book is the Aranyaka or Vanaparva. It was pointed out, in the study of the first chapter of the Bharata, that this Book or its incidents were probably an after-thought and were not included in the scheme of the first outline of the Epic. It is now a very agreeable corroboration of this idea to find that the Parva-Sangraha cannot ascribe it to the authorship of Vyasa.

Let us turn to the 8th Book.

It throws a powerful side-light on the secret of the redaction of the Bharata.

The first thing to be noted is that the authorship of Vyasa is not stated. But there is something to suggest the real authorship.

Let us read again the hemistich:—

अष्टमम् पर्व निर्दिष्टमेतद्भारतचिन्तकैः

'This is regarded, or treated, or denominated as the 8th Book by *Bharata Specialists*'. Who then was it that arranged the matter and distributed it into the several Books? In other words, who divided the text into Books? If the 8th Book was formed by Bharata Specialists, it follows that all the others were likewise devised by them.

If Vyasa had made the division into 18 Books, he could not have done so without some Book named as the 8th in his scheme. He could not have proceeded from the 7th Book to the 9th and completed his tale of 18 Books. It is clear, therefore, that it was the Bharata Specialists that really made the division into 18 Books.

Let us recall to mind the suggestion made in a previous portion of this study, that there was reason to believe, from a survey of the 'one hundred Parvas,' that, in an earlier form, at one stage, the only division known was into a hundred cantoes, corresponding in some sort to the division, in the post-scripts, of the text into cantoes of the same number. We may now regard this suggestion as good as proved.

If Vyasa had made the division for himself, how should the Bharata Scholars have anything left to be done by them in the matter?

The Specialists could have come into existence only long after the Bharata had been well-known, and a school like the Shakesperian was formed for special study.

Did the Bharata Specialists take it on themselves to write out a new Book and slip it in as the 8th? If they did not do that, they should have disarranged the

contents of some Book and created a new arrangement including the present 8th Book.

At all events, the concession, involved in any suggestion intended to get over the effect of the reference to Bharata Specialists, must be destructive of the authenticity of the notes in the Parva-Sangraha about the authorship, which we may now regard as open to serious objections.

Turning to the Preliminary enumeration we find only one canto assignable to Karna Parva. That is to say, the whole Book is one canto. This has already been noticed as surprising. According to the Parva Sangraha, we should have 69 chapters for this Book. But we have as many as 96 in the Calcutta copy and 101 in the Dravida. As to the number of Slokas we have close on 5000. How did it happen that this pretty large Book is not sub-divided into cantoes? The next Book, the 9th, about two-thirds of the 8th in extent, is divided into four cantoes. The 10th Book with less than 900 verses is apportioned into two cantoes.

The 11th Book, with about 800 verses, claims five cantoes of the Preliminary enumeration. How then should this Book, if it formed a part of the original draft, have been treated in this exceptional manner?

Taking all these facts together, there can be no doubt that this 8th Book was the creation of the Bharata Specialists and certainly neither the first nor the last heir of their invention. We may safely admit that it was not Vyasa that divided the text into 18 Books.

We will now turn to the Eleventh Book and study the last line of the Parvasangraha note to that Book. The last two lines run thus:—

इलोकसप्तशतीचापि पञ्चसप्ततिसंयुता

संख्यया भारताख्यानमुक्तम् व्यासेन धीमता

The first word in the last, *i.e.* 2nd line, creates some difficulty. It does not appear to be of a piece with the foregoing line. It conveys no sense if read as part of the 2nd line. It looks as if there was another line, between the first and second given above, which has been removed from the text. Leaving out the first word संख्यया the other words of the 2nd line mean 'the Bharata story was composed or told by Vyasa'. Now let us reflect about this. Is this the place for stating that Vyasa composed *the Bharata*? There are yet seven Books of the Bharata to be dealt with.

The eleventh Book is neither the first nor the last. The note about the authorship of the entire Bharata is out of place here. One suggestion is offered in the matter of this phenomenal note. The 2nd line above has all the appearance of a *truncated* Anushtubh. The writer is strongly of opinion that, between the last line and the line we now have above it, there must have existed another line, the first half of an Anushtubh, which the Bharata Specialists thought desirable to expunge. The lost line probably recorded the *number* of the Books, and may have conveyed some idea like this:—

" (In the Books as detailed above, *eleven*"),

(Read it with the line now occurring as the last)  
In number, the Bharata story was told by Vyasa.

This would make sense in a satisfactory manner.

Elsewhere, it will be found stated in this commentary that the Bharata really closes with the 11th Book; and that, at one time, the Bharata Poem ascribed to Vyasa really closed with the matter now found in the 11th Book.

Even as the last line above stands, it clearly connotes the finis of the Epic and the seven Books following are without warrant.

Let us now proceed to study the authorship of Books XII and XIII. These Books, the most important of the whole Bharata from the point of view of the sacred College of Bharata Specialists, stand without a sponsor. Vyasa's paternity is not stated. There need be no doubt about their spurious character.

A glance through the contents will show it. Sufficient has been stated in the foregoing pages by way of demonstrating their real character.

The 13th Book seems to have undergone recompilation even at a very late stage and after the canonical redaction of the Bharata text. The reckoning in the Parva-Sangraha allows only 146 chapters and 8000 verses to this Book.

We now find in the Dravida edition 274 chapters and 11151 verses. Further comment is superfluous. The compilers in this as in the other cases appear to have relied on the proverbial reverence of the readers, and the impossibility of their questioning the accuracy of the figures or attempting verification by making computations on their own account. Herein lay the safety of the Bharata Specialists. For the old adage गताहुगतिकोलोकः is no where so true as in this land.

We have next to deal with four Books, the XIV<sup>th</sup>, XV<sup>th</sup>, XVI<sup>th</sup>, and XVII<sup>th</sup>. These Books may be taken together. They agree in one respect, that the certificate of the Parva-Sangraha ascribes their authorship to an unknown तत्त्वदर्शी. The argument will be that this 'Knower of Truth' was meant for Vyasa.

But it is not apparent on what foundation. There is no appellative or epithet tacked on to suggest Vyasa. It is strange that the account of these four Books should have been rounded off with the help of a तत्त्वदर्शी.

Was this तत्त्वदर्शी really any other than the assistant or librarian of the sacred College who made out the total of the chapters and verses in the several Books? For, be it noted, that, the task assigned to the तत्त्वदर्शी is no more than 'reckoning up.' संख्यातास्तत्त्वदर्शिनः is the refrain.

A resume of the notes shows that, in the case of the other Books, where Vyasa is named there is in general something more than mere totalling of verses mentioned. A word is put in to imply or suggest composition also by Vyasa.

The idea of the तत्त्वदर्शी seems to have been associated first with the XIV<sup>th</sup> Book, and then carried forward for the succeeding Books as a happy suggestion.

This word occurs only once before in connection with the colophon for the VII<sup>th</sup> Book. But there it is at once followed by an appellative पाराशर्येण मुनिना, put in apposition, thus placing the matter beyond the possibility of a doubt.

At the end of the Sangraha for the XVIII<sup>th</sup> Book, which is the last, the authorship of Vyasa is distinctly noted and with some emphasis. It could not have been otherwise.

It is the last Book and could not go forth without the imprimatur of Vyasa. The exclusion of his name might be fatal. Its averment would support the idea that the authorship has continued right through the other Books.

It is of a piece with the similar certificate at the end of the Preliminary enumeration, that the hundred cantoes were of Vyasa's authorship.....

The 2nd chapter was not the work of Vyasa. It is the compilation of a late period devised to serve as an introduction to the redacted Bharata. It appears probable that, even subsequent to the original draft of this 2nd chapter, the same was frequently touched up from time to time.

The result of the foregoing discussion as to the authorship of the Books may be briefly stated.

1. The statement in the case of some of the Books that they were of Vyasa's composition is not conclusive in their favour.

2. The absence of all such mention may be taken as a sure indication of their want of ancient authority.

3. The last seven Books, the VIII<sup>th</sup>, and the III<sup>rd</sup>, may be treated as later additions.

4. We may take it that the original draft of the epic closed with some of the incidents of what is now the XI<sup>th</sup> Book.

5. That the original draft contained some of the matter that is now found in the first eleven Books.

6. That the Virata Parva was revised from start to finish.

7. The III<sup>rd</sup>, VIII<sup>th</sup> and XIII<sup>th</sup> Books are apparently spurious.

8. It appears probable in a great degree that the division of the text at one time was into cantoes only. Nothing was then known of the division into Books, which was a later idea.

9. It is not clear that, the first time the division into Books was started, the number of them was 18. The probability is to the contrary.

10. At the time of the division into Books, several portions of the text were rewritten; the last seven Books give indication of their having been repeatedly recast.

11. The number of Adhyayas and Slokas as given in the 2nd chapter does not tally with the number actually found in the existing texts; and the number of the same does not accord as between the several texts. The number of the Slokas as given in the Telugu Bharata does not agree with the number given in the Sanskrit 2nd chapter or with the actuals in any of the editions compared.

After a portion of this study had been printed, I had the advantage of consulting Alberuni's Indika. The book was written about 1030 A. D. This period was about the same as that of the first of the Telugu translators. The muslim Scholar lived for some years in the North-west of India. His

appetite for knowledge was very keen. His information on Indian sciences, arts and literature was immense. He obtained his knowledge on the spot from Shastris and Pundits.

He always took great care to verify his information. He has recorded a list of the Books of the Bharata, presumably based on the knowledge of the subject imparted to him by his Indian Gurus.

The list is given below. It is certainly calculated to take the reader by surprise and to make him regard with sympathetic attention the foregoing criticism. The list of the Books in the order in which we find them in the texts extant is also given for comparison.

* ALBERUNI'S LIST.	PRESENT LIST.
1 Sabhaparva	1 <i>Adiparva</i>
2 Aranya	2 Sabhaparva
3 Virata	3 Aranya
4 Udyoga	4 Virata
5 Bhishma	5 Udyoga
6 Drona	6 Bhishma
7 Karna	7 Drona
8 Salya	8 Karna
9 <i>Gada</i>	9 Salya
10 Saughtika	10 Saughtika
11 <i>Jalapradanika</i>	11 Striparva
12 Striparva	12 Santi
13 Santi	13 <i>Amusasanikam</i>
14 Aswamedha	14 Aswamedha
15 Mausala	15 Asramavasa

\* Vide Dr Edward C. Sachau's English edition of Alberuni's Indika, Vol 1, page 133. (Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co).

16 Asramavasa	16 Mausala
17 Prasthanika	17 (Maha) Prasthanikam
18 Swargarohanam	18 Swargarohanam

It is obvious from the above that the number of the Books as stated to Alberuni, was the same as we now possess, *to wit*, 18. But there is some variation in the names and the sequence.

(1) To begin with, the first Book noted in that scholar's list, we find, is Sabhaparva. This is now placed as the second Book. Our present first Book is the Adiparva. What had become of this in Alberuni's time or in that part of India where he spent his exile? It is a big Book with about 234 to 260 Adhyayas. The text was surely in esse. It probably passed under the name of Sabhaparva, which must have covered the first two Books of the present collation.

If Adiparva and Sabhaparva were separately named, the Pundits could not have misinformed the muslim Scholar, nor is it easy to conceive what motive they could have had to do so. And yet the period was a late one. A third of the eleventh century, A. D. was already covered.

The reckoning of the Sabhaparva as the first Book involves the alteration of the serial numbers of the Books as they now stand, by the subtraction of one in each case, up to a certain limit, though the names are found to be identical. These names are in agreement up to and inclusive of Salyaparva which is the eighth Book of Alberuni's list and the ninth of the existing text.

(2) The ninth Book named by Alberuni is Gada, or to give it its full name, Gadayuddhaparva the account of the duel or fight with clubs between Bhimaseña and Duryodhana.

We have no book of that name now, but we find the name given to a canto of the Salyaparva, the eighth Book of Alberuni's list, and the ninth of the present text, as shown in the above list.

When was this Book deprived of its rank as a Book and degraded to the position of a canto?

The next Book named by the learned Scholar is, Saptika, the tenth of his list as also of ours. This accordance is explained by the fact that the absence of Adiparva from his list and the absence of Gadaparva from our list has resulted in the equalization of the serial numbers at the figure 10.

Alberuni's eleventh Book is named Jalapradanika. There is no such Book in the present text. The vicissitudes of this segment of the text have been already dwelt on to some extent. Here is more light on the matter, agreeable, if unexpected.

The Jalapradanikam is now a chapter of the next Book, that is the Striparva.

As the eleventh Book of Alberuni's list lost its place as a Book in the revised text, his twelfth Book is our eleventh. This is the Striparva or 'The lamentations of the women.'

His thirteenth is our twelfth, the Santiparva. Our present thirteenth is a Book named Anusasanikam. But this name is wanting in Alberuni's list. He has made a note, however, that the Santiparva numbers

24000 verses. This is about the total of the verses in both the Santi and Anusasanika Parvas of the present text, taken together. It is thus apparent that both these Books must have existed in the Scholar's time under the name of Santiparva, if the number of the verses stated to him was not exaggerated.

The addition of the Anusasanika, has rectified the inequality of the serial numbers caused by the inclusion in Alberuni's list of Jalapradanikam. We therefore find that the fourteenth Book in his list is the same as the fourteenth of our text.

Again, at the fifteenth name we find a variation. His fifteenth is the Mausalaparva, which is now the sixteenth.

His sixteenth is the fifteenth of our copies. Why were they made to change places? His seventeenth and eighteenth are the same as those we now have.

A comparison of the present list with Alberuni's shows that he does not name two Books, Adiparva and Anusasanikam. He has included two which are not now found as Book-names, Gadayuddhaparva and Jalapradanika. The number eighteen of the Books is common to both.

In the case of Santiparva he adds a note that it comprises four cantoes which are named. These names tally exactly with the names as given in the 'Preliminary enumeration' and the postscripts of the Santiparva. That being so, it would be correct to suppose that what is now Anusasanikam could not have been included in Alberuni's Santiparva. But the fact remains that he states the number of the Slokas as

24000. This is the only Book in the case of which the learned Scholar gives the number of the slokas. He was possibly struck with amazement when the figure was stated to him, and wished to record it in particular. The Anusasanikam was at that time recognised as the name of one of the Books in the copies of southern India. It would therefore be safe to conclude that the Santiparva, on account of its hugeness, was split up in two after almost all the interpolations into that Book were concluded. This and the other changes, which a comparison of the two lists discloses, were probably wrought by the redactors, late in the evolution of the text, when the finishing touches were given.

The first Book was split up into two; so was the Santiparva. This increased the number of the Books to twenty; but, the number had to be maintained at eighteen. This was done by removing Gadayuddha and Jalapradanikam from the category of Books and re-naming them as cantoes.

The Mausalaparva, when it was first put into the text, appears to have been placed as the fifteenth Book. It was afterwards made to change places with the next Book, the Asramavasika. This seems to have been done advisedly. One reason for it may be suggested. In the Mausalaparva, the extinction of the Yadavas and of Krishna, the Avatar, is recorded. In the Asramavasika, the extinction of Dhritarashtra, Gandhari, Kunti and Vidura &c are recorded. Yudhishtira also goes to the forest Ashram to see the old folk and spend some time in their company.

In the Prasthanikam, the Pandavas start on their 'Pilgrim's progress', marching on to Eternity.

Krishna, the Avatar, was the support and mainstay of the Pandavas. They were themselves of divine essence. When Krishna passed away the call came to them, the signal for their long journey. It was not meet or proper that they should have tarried longer here. To interpose the Ashram incidents between the news received by them of the passing of Krishna and their own departure was wanting in a perception of the higher proprieties. The Mausala was therefore placed next before the Prasthanika.

When the proxies of Vyasa revised the text in the tenth century and introduced changes, the same would have been embodied in copies earlier in some parts of the country than in others.

Kashmir is in the extreme northwest and it is probable that Alberuni wrote before the alterations got fixed in the manuscripts of that part of India.

## CHAPTER II.

As part of the present study, we have next to proceed to chapters 59, 60, 61, 62, which occur in both the Calcutta and Dravida texts, in the same order of sequence, and are numbered for chapters as above.

The intervening chapters from 3 to 58 comprise three cantoes, Pāṣhyam. पौष्यम्, Pāṣṭhānam पौष्टिकम्, and Astikam आस्तीकम्, which have nothing to do with the Bharata story. Even the last of them Astikam which deals with the serpent sacrifice, alleged to have been carried on for some time by Janamejaya, has really no connection with the epic at all. The only connection devised being that the epic was recited by Vaisamapayana to Janamejaya and the motley congregation that assembled for the sacrifice.

The sacrifice started by Janamejaya did not and could not have formed a topic of Vyasa's epic.

Chapters 3 to 58 were the narration of the Sauti to Saunaka and the assembly, in answer to questions put by Saunaka in connection with topics other than the subject matter of the epic. They do not purport to have formed a part of Vaisampayana's recital; and a cursory view will satisfy the reader that they never formed and could not have formed a part of it. If chapters 3 to 58 were taken out, the chapters 59 to 62 would stand as prefatory chapters and might be numbered as 1, 2, 3, 4, but for the super-imposition of the present chapters 1 and 2. Anyhow they form preliminary chapters and have to be taken with chapters 1 and 2 for study.

Let us now turn to chapter 59. It is a very short one of about 10 verses and yet a very important one. It may be rendered thus:— Saunaka:—"O Sauti, You have told us all about the generations starting with Bhrigu. I am very much pleased with all this. I ask you again. *I should like to hear the stories told by Vyasa. The stories narrated in the intervals of leisure afforded by the rituals of the serpent sacrifice conducted by Janamejaya.*

We wish to hear from you, O Sauti! those stories."

The Sauti:— 'Brahmins narrated Vedic stories. And Vyasa narrated the interesting and great story of the 'Bharata.'

Saunaka: 'The story of the Maha Bharata was narrated by Vyasa, at the solicitation of Janamejaya. I wish to hear that story faithfully.



The Sauti, 'O Sir, I shall then narrate it to you with the greatest pleasure. You shall have the whole of it from me from the very beginning, for, I shall have as great pleasure in reciting it as you would have in listening to it.'

1. It is clear from the above, that up till now nothing of Vyasa's narration was recited to Saunaka, no part of the Bharata of Vyasa as narrated to Janamejaya. And Saunaka wishes to hear it now.

2. Another matter stated here is that the recital to Janamejaya was by Vyasa and not Vaisampayana.

But in the very next chapter we shall read that Vaisampayana acted as the Rhapsodist. It was at a very early period thought that the dignity of the great Rishi, who was regarded by tradition as an Avatar, would suffer by degrading him to the level of a Rhapsodist.

3. The Sauti, in his closing words, says that he will start the recital of the Bharata from the very beginning. It is therefore beyond doubt that the Bharata was not begun yet.

We pass on to chapter 60.

The Rishi Vyasa, hearing of Janamejaya's enterprise in starting the Sarpa-Yaga, went to visit him. He was received with all the honours due to his position and holiness. After greetings over, the king said to the Rishi :—

जनमेजयउवाच.

कुरुणाम् पाण्डवानां च भवान् प्रत्यक्षदर्शिवान्  
तेषाम् चरितमिच्छामि कथ्यमानम् त्वया द्विज ॥  
कथम् समभवद्भेदं तेषामहिष्टकर्मणाम्

तच्च युद्धम् कथम् वृत्तम् भूतान्तेकरणम् महत् ॥  
पितामहानाम् सर्वेषाम् दैवेनाविष्टचेतसाम्  
कात्स्न्येनैतन्ममाचक्ष्व यथावृत्तम् द्विजोत्तम ॥

सौतिः

तस्य तद्वचनम् श्रुत्वा कृष्णद्वैपायनस्तदा  
शशास शिष्यमासीनम् वैशंपायनमन्तिके ॥

व्यासः.

कुरुणाम् पाण्डवानाम् च यथा भेदोऽभवत् पुरा  
तदस्मै सर्वमाचक्ष्व यन्मतः श्रुतवानसि ॥  
गुरोर्वचनमाज्ञाय स तु विप्रर्षभस्तदा  
आचक्ष्व ततस्मै त्वमितिहासम् पुरातनम् ॥  
राज्ञे तस्मै मदस्येभ्यः पार्थिवेभ्यश्च सर्वशः  
भेदम् सर्वविनाशम् च कुरुपाण्डवयोस्तदा ॥

Janamejaya to Vyasa.

'O Brahmin! You were *an eye-witness* of the Kurus and the Pandus. I wish that their history should be narrated *by you*. How the trouble between them arose, though they were righteous people; and how that war of extermination was fought out between them, my grandsires, who were overtaken by a ruinous fate.'

'Please tell me in full all about it, even as it transpired, O! you best of Brahmins!' The Sauti- 'Vyasa, having heard this question, directed his pupil Vaisampayana who sat beside him to narrate the story.'

Vyasa - "Tell him all, what all you heard from me, all as to *how the quarrels arose* between the Kurus and the Pandus."

The Sauti: "That learned Brahmin, accepting the commandment of his guru, narrated the whole of the ancient *traditional* account to the King, the princes, priests and guests, *about the disagreement* between the Kurus and Pandus and their mutual destruction."

(1) What did the King wish to hear and what was narrated to him?

(2) Why does not Vyasa tell the King that he had composed a poem, that Ganesa copied it and that he taught it to Vaisampayana who would recite it?

(3) Why does he not excuse himself to the King or say one word by way of introducing his pupil. The King wished to hear from his own lips as he was an eye-witness.

(4) The direction was to recite all about the quarrel and their mutual extermination. We may take it that this was done. So then the narration could not have gone beyond the first eleven Books.

(5) When Vyasa turns to his pupil, he says 'what you heard', not 'what you had studied under me'.

Let us first settle what it was that the King wished to hear and what it was that Vaisampayana recited to him.

It was the history of his grandsires, their cousins included, that he wished to hear, how each fraternity fell out with the other, what led to the quarrel and how the war fared. Vaisampayana recited to him, how the disputes arose between them and how the great war ended in the annihilation of the two factions.

We are told that in the matter of this history, Vaisampayana was directed to narrate *all*. That he

undertook to do so and narrated all. This is tantamount to saying that all that Vaisampayana had heard from Vyasa was narrated and that it went no farther than the termination of the war.

We need not therefore hesitate in rejecting the last seven Books of the Bharata as not having been comprised in Vaisampayana's recital or in Vyasa's narration to Vaisampayana. This admission should be conclusive on the question or, at all events, it strengthens the chain of evidence leading up to the same result. Let us next consider the King's request preferred to Vyasa. He wished to hear the story related by Vyasa himself. He wished to hear the relation from the Rishi's own lips. Why? The king assigned a very good reason for it. Vyasa was an eye-witness and from him the story would come at first hand. The king knew nothing of Vaisampayana's equipment for the task assigned to him. The king did not foresee it. Vaisampayana was not an eye-witness. If he was, for which there is no record, the king did not know of it. He never thought of the pupil in this connection.

When Vyasa is asked to tell the story he gives no reply to the king. He turns abruptly to his pupil and commands him to narrate for the king. He does not excuse himself to the king of the land as ordinary civility and good manners require. He says no word by way of apology or by way of introducing his illustrious pupil to the king, if only to tell the latter that the former would do quite as well in giving the story. Any way it was an awkward situation. I suppose we may fairly infer from this that the original idea of the first compilers was, as stated in the previous chapter, that Vyasa told the story to Janamejaya. Of course, it did not

stand well with the sacred college of a later generation and the pupil had to be substituted for the guru.

There is something more that requires consideration here. We must remember that, before the Rishi visited the king, the Bharata had been ready, written out in the form in which we now find it- Ganesa made the copy.

As a matter of ordinary prudence, the Rishi would have taken the copy to the court. It was an excellent opportunity to publish it. All the piety and all the learning of the land had assembled there. It had not been published before. Vyasa could not have obtained a better opportunity for its publication. It would be a compliment to the ruler. Janamejaya was the heir of the Pandus. He was the only living head of the illustrious line of the Kurus and the Pandus. Why then did not the Rishi take this copy there?

We may take it that a poem is reduced to writing with a view to its publication or circulation and not merely to be locked up in a safe, at all events, a poem of this character. However that may be, when the king asked the Rishi to relate the story, how did it happen that Vyasa did not tell the king that he had composed an epic poem of the whole story and that Ganesa had made a copy of it? If the poem had been made ready at the time, is it probable that Vyasa should have made no mention of it? Why should he suppress it? We must remember that the epic had already been taught in full to Vaisampayana who knew the whole of it by heart. A proper reply to the king's request was to tell him that a big poem had been composed by the Rishi, covering the whole ground; that his pupil

knew it and could repeat it; that the pupil would recite in full or in brief as it pleased the king. If after delivering this reply, the Rishi turned to his disciple and asked him to make a start, the arrangement would have been in more decent order.

We may fairly infer from the foregoing that the compilers of this and the previous chapter knew nothing of the reduction of the poem to writing either by Ganesa or some other.

The remark of Vyasa to Vaisampayana यन्मत्तः श्रुत्वानसि does not convey the idea that a poem had been composed by Vyasa and got by rote by Vaisampayana. The disciple heard the story from the Guru, but in what form we do not yet know from these lines.

#### (CHAPTER 61.)

We shall now proceed to C. 61.

Here again we find a summary of the Bharata-story. It will be useful to compare this summary with those which have gone before in the first and second chapters of the Bharata. It seems to have been brought up to a very late period of Bharata progress, and yet, there are omissions and variations in it which are significant.

In this summary, of an undoubtedly advanced period, we find the poem developed, so far as the First Book goes, much like what we find it now.

The attempts of Duryodhana to take the life of the Pandus, in particular of Bhimasena, are referred to in detail. But here, in the first instance, we may mention an omission for which it is difficult to account. The incident of Bhima having been pushed into deep water

at the bathing ghat is stated, but not the sequel of it that Bhima went down into Nagaloka and there glutted himself with the elixir of life. This idea was probably of a yet later date. In the abstract given in the first chapter of the Bharata, we find it stated that, when the Pandus were at Hastinapura in their boyhood and adolescence, with their cousins, they grew up unmolested and without anything to fear from anyone.

In this chapter, however, we are told the very opposite of that:—

नामृषन् कुरवोदृष्ट्वा पाण्डवान् श्रीयशोभृतः  
तेषाम् निग्रहनिर्वासान् विविधांस्ते समारभन्

and then follow the references to the attempts to slay Bhima.

‘The Kauravas were seized with envy at the growing good fortune and good name of the Pandus.’

‘They started devising ways and means of seizure and expulsion of the Pandus.’

It is clear that, in a later age, this portion of the story was re-written, in almost its present form, to paint in dark colours the iniquities of the Kauravas. It is surprising that no mention is made of the Rajasuya sacrifice at all.

The abstract as given in this chapter is contained in 47 verses, of which 44 verses cover the ground of the 1st of the 18 Books ! The rest of the Bharata story is compressed into three verses. *The abstract terminates with the war.* This adds one more piece of evidence as to the hypothesis that the original composition of the Bharata terminated with the eleventh Book.

There is no reference to the last seven Books. Some Bharata specialist seems to have discovered that the abstract required being supplemented. He therefore added a few verses at the close of this chapter, which will be found set out and marked as doubtful in the Dravida text. These extra verses refer to the contents of the last seven Books. The fact that it was thought necessary to interpolate these verses is very significant.

We learn something new in the abstract given in this chapter. We are told that the immediate cause of the scheme about the game with dice was Duryodhana's cupidity for the new palace erected by Maya for the Pandavas.

“Maya erected a wonderful palace set with all varieties of precious stones. That dullard, the evil-minded Duryodhana, coveted the same and so he had Yudhishtira cheated at dice and drove him to the forest,.....&c.”

[In the first chapter we were told, that it was the splendour of the Rajasuya that excited his envy and that the ridicule to which he was subjected when he tripped and fell on the pavement roused his bile and prompted the Dyuta.]

The incident of Arjuna's battle with Indra at the time of the Khandava conflagration is not stated. With the omission of the Rajasuya, the victorious campaigns, north, south, east and west, of Yudhishtira's brothers are also wanting.

One significant omission is the ill-usage to which Draupadi was subjected at the close of the Dyuta. The abstract gives no indication of the game having

been played twice. But that may pass. The wonder is that no reference has been made to the outrage perpetrated on Draupadi.

The close attention, that the text received from time to time on the part of Bharata specialists, is demonstrated by another interpolation into this chapter, found in the Dravida copy and marked as doubtful.

तीर्थयात्राम् च कृतवान् नागकन्यामवापच

पाण्ड्यस्य तनयाम् लब्ध्वा तत्र ताभ्याम् सहोषितः

'Then Arjuna went on a tour of pilgrimage. He obtained a Nagakanya (serpent-princess.)

Having also obtained the daughter of the Pandya, he lived with them there.'

Some explanation is wanted. In the abstract we are told that Arjuna had to be sent into the forest for a period of 13 months. The language used is वनम् प्रस्थापयामास. At some period, this exile of Arjuna into the forest was developed into a tour of pilgrimage and designated as his तीर्थयात्रा. In the text we find many agreeable adventures ascribed to him in this brief period. The cupidity or venality of the southern specialists found an opportunity here to connect Arjuna with the southern Dravidian dynasty of the Pandyas. We read in the text that in the course of his tour, he lighted on the Pandyas. The sovereign had an only daughter for his issue. She was wedded to Arjuna under the old Vedic arrangement of the appointed daughter, by which, the son begotten on the princess would be claimed as heir to the princess's father and not as Arjuna's son.

The southern specialists appear to have observed that the want of a reference to this Pandya incident in

this abstract might be construed as throwing doubts on its authenticity, and slyly slipped in a reference to it in the verse quoted above.

This is an apt illustration of the methods pursued by the Bharata scholars.

There is no doubt about Arjuna having spent his exile in the forest. For we read in this chapter that he lived a whole year and a month in the forest, and that he proceeded straight from the forest to Dwaraka, the place of Krishna. In the text of the epic we, however, find it stated that Arjuna went to the Pandyan's place in the thirteenth month and lived there for considerably more than a year. He is said to have left the place after the birth of a son and after presenting him to the Pandyan to continue his line.

All this does not consort with the sequence of events, as stated in this abstract; for, the visit to Dwaraka is placed in the abstract as next after he left the forest, where, undoubtedly, he spent the thirteenth month. The revisers of the text, not being familiar with a thirteen months year, thought they were safe in timing his visit to the Dravidian capital as having occurred in the thirteenth month. The thirteen months of Arjuna's forest life, and the subsequent exile of the Pandus into the forest in the third Book for a period of thirteen years, stand on the same footing; the idea of the thirteen years is only an amplification of that of the thirteen months. There is no doubt therefore that the adventure in Pandyanad was a later interpolation.

## CHAPTER III.

We may pass on to the next chapter, 62, in both the editions.

It opens with a long question by Janamejaya, asking for the detail of the Bharata story, and the rest of the chapter is the reply of Vaisampayana eulogising the Mahabharata and enjoining the study of the epic on one and all, on account of the manifold spiritual and temporal advantages of the study.

We are told here that this work of one hundred thousand verses was composed by Vyasa. Even here we are not told that Ganesa made the copy or of Brahma's suggestion to Vyasa to employ Ganesa as the scribe (see verse 14). In the Dravida text we find some more verses in this context not found in the Calcutta copy. As usual the extra verses included in the Dravida copy are marked as doubtful:—

उपाख्यानै सह ज्ञेयम् श्राव्यम् भारतमुत्तमम्  
संक्षेपेण तु वक्ष्यामि सर्वमेतन्नराधिप  
अध्यायानाम् सहस्रे द्वे पर्वणाम् शतमेव च  
श्लोकानान्तु सहस्राणि नवतिश्च दशैव च  
ततोष्टादशभिः पर्वैः संगृहीतम् महर्षिणा

“It is to be understood that the Bharata should be taken as inclusive of upakhyānam. I shall state in brief all this.

- 1 There are two thousand chapters.
- 2 one hundred cantoes, and
- 3 one hundred thousand slokas ;
- 4 then the whole was divided into eighteen Books by the great Rishi.”

We shall presently find that this is a new statement of the case.

How Vaisampayana came to speak of the upakhyānam is a matter for some surprise. Of chapters, we should have according to the present account 2000; In the 2nd chapter of the Bharata, the number of chapters for each Book is given. The total of these figures gives us 1933. In the Calcutta edition the existing adhyāyas number 2113 and in the Dravida edition we have as many as 2314. One hundred, the number of the cantoes, is the traditional number into which a division has been forced in the postscripts. But the real number set out in the preliminary enumeration is much larger. This has been pointed out already.

The number of slokas is again stated as one hundred thousand. According to the reckoning given in the Telugu Bharata, we should have seven hundred more. This number, one lakh, which has been often repeated and passed unchallenged, does not accord with facts. Comparing it with the totals given in the Parva-sangraha it is far in excess. For, in the latter we find that the totals come to only 84836. In the Calcutta edition the number actually found is 82759. In the Dravida it is 96416. These variations have been dwelt on.

But there is one circumstance that requires notice here. In the detail of the Parva-sangraha (the second chapter) 12000 verses are assigned to Hari-vamsa, which is treated as a portion of the Bharata; and the number, one hundred thousand, was inclusive of the Hari-vamsa.

Bharata specialists took advantage of the number stated. It would not be noticed every day how this one lakh of verses was distributed. The consciousness was allowed to grow up that the one lakh of verses represented the extent of Bharata proper. Then, under cover of this notion, the text was amplified even at very late periods. And here, for the first time, in this abstract, we find it stated that the extent of the Bharata, without the Harivamsa, is of one hundred thousand slokas. Let us proceed. We are told in this chapter:—

त्रिभिर्वर्षैर्लेब्धकामः कृष्णद्वैपायनो मुनिः

निलोत्थितः शुचिः शक्तो महाभारतमादितः

तपोनियम मास्थाय कृतमेतन्महर्षिणा

त्रिभिर्वर्षैस्सदोत्थायी कृष्णद्वैपायनो मुनिः

महाभारतमाख्यानम् कृतवानिदमद्भुतम्

‘For three years, the great Rishi, Vyasa worked at the composition of the Bharata, from beginning to end, early and late, day after day, with a holy purpose, which he achieved in three years.’

So then, he took three years to compose this epic. Here at least Vaisampayana should have told Janamejaya that the copy or fair copy was prepared by Ganesa. The fact remains that he did not say it.

Nor is there any suggestion of the ‘Magnum Opus’ of Vyasa of 60 lakhs of verses or the distribution of at least 59 of them in other worlds than ours.

At this point there is a variation in the arrangement of the chapters as between the two texts. The next chapter, that is, the 63rd in the Calcutta edition occurs as the 64th in the Dravida copy.

In this chapter there is an account of a certain eponymous hero named Uparicharavasu, who, we are told, started the cult of the Indradhwaja (the May pole of some European countries. The Dud of Egypt—a cult which according to some scholars, had its origin in the days of the Pole-star worship.) We find also narrated in this chapter, the story of the birth of Vyasa who was begotten on his maiden-mother by the Rishi Parasara. We are told that Vyasa not only redacted the Vedas but that he also taught them and the Mahabharata to Sumantu, Jaimini, Paila, to his own son Suka and also to Vaisampayana.

Cf. Telugu text which is to the same effect.  
Note—the position in the Telugu text of this information.

वेदा नध्यापयामास महाभारतपञ्चमान्

सुमन्तुम् जैमिनिम् पैलम् शुक्रश्चैव स्वमात्मजम्

प्रभुर्वरिष्ठो वरदो वैशम्पायनमेव च

संहितास्तैः पृथक्तेन भारतस्य प्रकाशिताः

“The great one, the giver of boons, taught the five Vedas, inclusive of the *Mahabharata*, to Sumantu, Jaimini, Paila, to his own son Suka and also to Vaisampayana.

*Several editions of the Bharata were published, one by each of these individuals on his own account.”*

(a) The suggestion contained in the phrase महाभारतपञ्चमान् is that the Bharata ought to be regarded as the fifth Veda.

(b) There is no doubt that the name Mahabharata has been associated only with the Book which we are now studying, that which has been handed down to us.

(c) It was this text then that he taught to all the five named above and no other.

(d) The most important item of information given above is that these pupils of Vyasa brought out several editions of the Mahabharata. Vaisampayana was one of these authors. We must bear in mind that the speaker here is Vaisampayana and there is the grotesque circumstance that, instead of speaking of himself in the first person singular as he should have done in the ordinary course, he mentions himself by name among the pupils. This sounds strange for ordinary experience.

The truth is that Vaisampayana's entrance on the stage is premature. The compilers appear to have thought that the start of the Bharata should not be withheld for long after the close of the Astika-Parva and brought out Vaisampayana too early.

But what became of those several editions, at the time that Vaisampayana was speaking, just opening the story to Janamejaya?

What became of his own edition, which with the rest of the pupils he had published?

What time elapsed between the composition by Vyasa and the independent epics of his pupils?

Did each one of these pupils rewrite the story in his own language? Otherwise each text would have been a copy of each one of the other productions. I think we may fairly understand from the above that, at the time when the present Bharata was redacted, there were several epic poems dealing with the subject, in the field. That Bharata specialists sat to work to unify all these and absorb them into one huge work, so that the others ceased to have any independent life, as, after

the redaction of the present text, it was a waste of time and labour to copy them.

These chapters, from the 59th, are all preliminary chapters of some one or more of the Mahabharatas of Vyasa's pupils. Whether they were excerpted from one author or several cannot be conjectured.

They correspond to the first two chapters of the existing Bharata.

The panegyric on the Mahabharata, the exhortations for a religious study of it, the benedictions pronounced and blessings invoked on the student of the Bharata contained in chapter 61, the abstract of contents in chapter 60, the declaration in chapter 62 that Vyasa composed the Bharata and took three years in which to finish it, are all in keeping with the usage and propriety of prefatory detail.

These chapters were undoubtedly the opening chapters of some text, perhaps of this very text, of the Bharata. But their place in the existing text has been more elaborately supplied by the first two chapters of the redactors. This was necessitated by the prefixion of the first three cantoes, which, even a perfunctory notice would show, are thoroughly irrelevant. It is very probable that the first two chapters were amplified and rewritten from fragments of superseded chapters.



## CHAPTER IV.

We have been told repeatedly that the Bharata was recited in the intervals of time allowed by the ritual of the Sarpayaga of Janamejaya. But on a close examination of this matter it appears that this was an after-thought. The Telugu Bharata places the matter beyond doubt. Here we find that, after the Sarpayaga was closed and the priests had been dismissed with presents and everything connected with the Yaga was over, on some day, Vyasa with his pupils went to visit Janamejaya and that he was requested to tell the Bharata story.

Turning to Astika Parva we find that Vyasa and his pupils were there and among the number technically known as the सद्स्याः, an advisory body, whose function was to see in general that the ritual was correctly observed and to decide on questions of doubt or difficulty.

In the Astika Parva we also find that, when the Yaga was brought to a close at the instance of Astika, *he left the place and went home.*

In the course of the Astika Parva we do not find any suggestion that the Bharata was started and gone through. The said Parva ends with chapter 58. It is therefore a matter for some surprise to find in chapter 60 Vyasa introduced with his pupils, and a pretty long account of the welcome and reception he met with.

The chapter starts with a verse saying that Vyasa having heard that the King was initiated for the sacrifice went in with his pupils. But as stated above we found Vyasa and his pupils already among the Sadasyas in the

Astika Parva. It is clear therefore that chapter 60 has no connection whatever with the Astika Parva and does not come in happily after chapter 58. The incongruity has arisen from the interpolation of the Astika Parva.

It is possible to suggest that in the Astika Parva no mention was made of the King's request to Vyasa for the Bharata story and the same was not started as it would cause a digression and mar the even course of the Yaga.

This suggestion may or may not hold. But why was the welcome and reception accorded to the great Rishi left out there? Why was no mention made of it? It was perfectly within the line of that Parva. It is surprising that the only intimation of Vyasa's presence at the sacrifice should have been given by the insertion of his name in a catalogue of the holy men present there. The above suggestion, assuming it to hold, does not enable us to get over the difficulty caused by the Telugu text, which distinctly states, in the portion standing for the translation of chapter 60, that it was after the close of the Yaga. Is there any reason to believe that, if the Sanskrit text said that '*during the progress of the sacrifice*' the Bharata was started, the Telugu author should have stated that it was '*after the completion of the sacrifice.*'

It looks as if when the Astika Parva was written out, Vyasa's name was not in it in the first instance. But that when it suited the purpose of the compilers to say that the Bharata was recited during the session of the Yaga, Vyasa's name was introduced among those of the Sadasyas. In view of chapter 60 which deals

with the reception, more in that line was avoided in the Astika Parva. It is conceivable that, as part of this plan, the first verse of chapter 60 was altered to read as it does now.

We lost sight of Astika in chapter 58 of the First Book. We are told in that chapter that he went away. But if the Bharata was being recited at the sacrifice, this involves the circumstance that he must have listened to the entire story. The compilers appear to have been mindful of this and, therefore, at the close of the 18th Book, we are told that Astika took leave and left, suggesting that he continued to attend until then. It is clear that the interpolators perceived that there was absolutely no connection between the Bharata and the Astika Parva. In their anxiety to devise some plausible connection, they invented the story that the Bharata was recited during the session of the Yaga.

At what stage of the recital did Astika go in? It is certain that the last scene in the Yaga was being enacted. Takshaka was being called out by the spells and incantations, when Astika intervened. Did the recital of the Bharata story continue after the Yaga closed? There is no information as to these queries. So far as we can follow the references in the text, the recital probably closed with the Yaga.

I shall show presently that the story of the Sauti having been present at the serpent-sacrifice, of the Bharata having been recited there, and of the Sauti having listened to such recital—all this is pure invention. Let us study the introduction to the Astika Parva, such as we find it in chapter 12 of the First Book (Adi Parva), in the Calcutta copy. This chapter is pre-

fatory to the Astika Parva, which starts with the 13th chapter.

In chapter 12, a dialogue is recorded between Ruru, an ancestor of Saunaka, and a Rishi who had just assumed his human form after a lengthy and unwholesome existence as a serpent. A youthful frolic cost him dear. His fellow-student pronounced a curse on him as the result of which the young Rishi became a water-snake.

It was promised that the curse would be at an end and he would recover his proper form when he should meet Ruru. This came to pass.

The water-snake turned into a man, and the new Rishi gave some wholesome advice to Ruru on the exercise of ordinary humanity and kindness even towards the humblest in creation. He drew the attention of Ruru to the outrageous conduct of Janamejaya and the barbarity of his sarpayaga.

There is no information as to the length of time the metamorphosed Rishi spent in the form of the serpent.

It is not probable that the water-snake had received much information about the doings at the Court of Janamejaya. The information about the Sarpayaga must have been received by the Rishi before he changed his form into that of a snake.

A long period must have elapsed therefore between the Sarpayaga and the time of Ruru. The Rishi tells Ruru that, in a period long gone by before them, the

Sarpa-satra of Janamejaya took place and that the serpent-species was saved by the intercession of Astika.

When the Rishi was asked for details he said Ruru might hear the story from the Brahmins, who presumably would know all about it. Ruru appears to have got the story subsequently from his father, whose name is recorded as Pramati.

We do not know whether Pramati knew of these incidents as a contemporary or learnt the same from his elders as a matter of tradition. That these events did not transpire in Ruru's time is certain, for, if it were otherwise, he should himself have known of them.

Ruru was at least the grandfather of Saunaka to whom the Sauti narrated the story. At the earliest, the incidents of the Sarpa-satra must go back to the period of Pramati. We are also told that Astika was the pupil of Pramati. It is clear that, at the time of the visit of the Sauti, the ancestors of Saunaka had all passed away; otherwise, Saunaka would not have attained to the headship of the clan, and the dignity of Patriarch. He must himself have been, at that time, of advanced years. With this introduction, we may peruse chapter 13 of the Calcutta Edition, Adi-parva. This is what we have:—

शौनक उवाच

“किमर्थम् राजशार्दूल स्सराजा जनमेजयः  
सर्पसत्रेण सर्पाणाम् कृतोन्तम् तद्वदस्व मे  
आस्तीकश्च द्विजश्रेष्ठः किमर्थम् जपताम् वरः  
मोचयामास भुजगान् प्रदीप्तादसुरेतसः  
कस्य पुत्र स्सराजासीत् सर्पसत्रम् य आहरत्  
स च द्विजातिप्रवरः कस्य पुत्रोऽभिधत्स्व मे

सौतिरुवाचः

इतिहासमिमम् विप्राः पुराणम् परिचक्षते  
कृष्णद्वैपायनप्रोक्तम् नैमिशारण्यवासिषु  
पूर्वम् प्रचोदितस्सूतः पितामे लोमहर्षणः  
शिष्यो व्यासस्य मेधावी ब्राह्मणोऽविदमुक्तवान्  
तस्मादहमुपश्रुत्य प्रवक्ष्यामि यथातथम्

इदमास्तीकमाख्यानम्.

Saunaka:—“Wherefore did the great King Janamejaya make an end of the serpents at the serpent-sacrifice and wherefore did that great Brahmin rescue the serpents from the fire:—”

The Sauti:—“This story is regarded as a Purana, recounted to the dwellers in the Naimisha forest by ‘Krishna Dwaipayana’ (Vyasa). My father, before me, a faithful pupil of Vyasa recited the story to some Brahmins. *I learnt this from him* and I shall now tell you the story of Astika in full”.—

The question put by Saunaka makes it clear that the story of Astika was ancient, that Janamejaya belonged to the remote past.

The answer of the Sauti makes it equally clear that the story of Astika was regarded as a matter of ancient tradition.

It is surprising that Saunaka should have been ignorant as to the parentage of Janamejaya. This is conceivable, if at all, as caused by the lapse of a long period of time after Janamejaya had passed away.

The answer of the Sauti discloses the fact that, at some remote period, the story was published or recited

as a Purana by Vyasa among the dwellers of the Naimisha forest, that is to say, the ancestors of those whom the Sauti is now addressing.

In the previous generation, the father of the Sauti told the story to some Brahmins. The Sauti learnt the itihasa from his father and is thus fully qualified and starts reciting to Saunaka and the dwellers in the hermitage.

It is clear, therefore, that the Sauti himself learnt the story by oral tradition from his father. He did not know Janamejaya or Astika.

He himself was of the fourth or fifth generation from the elders of the time of Janamejaya or Astika. To him it was old time tradition and nothing more, for, he adds:—

**आजहार महायज्ञम् सर्पसत्रम् इतिश्रुतिः**

‘*The tradition is that the serpent-sacrifice was brought about by Janamejaya.*’

It is beyond question, therefore, that the Sauti could not have heard the Mahabharata recited at the serpent-sacrifice of Janamejaya, for the Sauti was not then in existence and did not come into existence until perhaps a hundred years later.

And yet, it was only a couple of hours or so earlier that the Sauti told Saunaka and his companions that he had heard the Bharata recited by Vaisampayana during the serpent-sacrifice of Janamejaya, of which he claimed to be an eye-witness, and just returned from there.

He says much the same thing again in chapter 59 which follows after the close of this canto of Astika Parva.

Again at the close of the Mahabharata, in the very last chapter, we are told by the Sauti from his own knowledge that Astika was present right to the finish of Vaisampayana's recitation of the Bharata and was then dismissed with presents like the rest of the holy and distinguished guests. On the other hand, at the close of the Astika Parva, we have this note:—

**इत्याख्यानम् मयास्तीकम् यथावत्तव कीर्तितम्**

**यथा कथितवान् ब्रह्मन् प्रमतिः पूर्वजस्तव**

**पुत्राय रुखे प्रीतः पृच्छते भार्गवोत्तम**

“This then is the story of Astika, which I have related to you just as it happened,.....just as Pramati your ancestor had related to his enquiring son Ruru.” (your=Saunaka's)

The moral is plain that the canto of Astika Parva we are now reading was originally an independent composition drafted into this huge cento of the Mahabharata.

The author, whoever he was, of this story of Astika, had made up his mind to give it the introduction that it now has in the usual Puranic manner, *i. e.*, of its having been recited by the son of the Puranic Suta some generations after the serpent-sacrifice.

But the Bharata specialists when they collated the Bharata hit on the idea of connecting the recital of the Bharata with the serpent-sacrifice.

As the Sauti's agency was indispensable, they had to place him also at Janamejaya's sarpa-satra, where he could conveniently listen to the recital by Vaisampayana.

The absurdity of contradiction arose when somebody's story of Astika was imported entire and centoed into the Bharata, by another batch of specialists.

The Telugu author was probably pressed with this difficulty, for he has left untranslated the introductory portion of the Astika Parva.

## APPENDIX I.

### (1) *Pandu's Fatal mistake.*

Pandu's Fatal mistake resulted, in the first instance, in the death of the Metamorphosed Rishi and ultimately in his own death. To explain the real meaning of this incident, as also of the two following, I think it expedient to transcribe here extracts from an article contributed by me, a few years ago, to the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. The article is an abstract of the conclusions of the late J. F. Hewitt in his 'History and chronology of the myth-making age'.

#### *'The year ruled over by Orion, The Deer-Sun-God'*

A new rule of time-measurement was inaugurated. The metaphors of this Era for the astronomical fables were drawn from the chase. *The Year-Sun* was a deer who went through his course in obedience to the control of the Pole-star and was hunted by Orion, the hunter of the heavens.

The image of the hunting-God is a variant of the original storm-God, Rudra, or the Pole-star. Orion was the working deputy of this principal. The similitude of the deer was suggested by the constant experience of the early men.

The cave-men of the palaeolithic age, domesticated the reindeer. The dropping of his horns in Autumn told them of the approach of Winter and their re-growth in Spring heralded the advent of Summer. They therefore used the deer as the symbol of the Sun.

In Scandinavia and North-Germany, the New-year's festivals begin 12 days in advance. On the last day, a drama is enacted. Before the closing hour, the actor playing the God is disguised as a deer and courts a woman disguised as a doe. They sing ribald songs together, till the last moments arrive; and then the Sun-God seizes the doe and, as he attacks her, he is shot by the ball of the wild hunter, now, but he was formerly shot by the hunter's arrow.

The story of the hunted deer-Sun-God has its variants. One Indian version appears in the Aitareya Brahmana, III-33. There, Prajapati, (here we must understand Orion), in the form of a deer, pursued his daughter Rohini (Aldebaran, the queen of the Pleiades), who fled in the form of a doe. This was at the end of the month of Mriga-Sirsha (deer's head), ending with the winter-solstice. He violated her, and, as he did so, he was shot with the three-knotted arrow of Rudra, the storm-God form of the Pole-star. This arrow is indicated by the three stars in Orion's belt.

The stars and the arrow symbolised the three seasons of the year. The feather of the arrow was the Spring, the shaft was the Summer, and the barb was the Winter.

From the union of Prajapati and Rohini sprang, according to the Rig-Veda, Vastôshpati, the household-fire, which symbolised the new Sun-God born to replace the dead deer-Sun of the expiring year.

In the above fable, Orion is the hunted deer-Sun and he is shot by the year-arrow which brings about his death.

The year-Sun-deer, who is killed to make room for the new Sun, appears in the Ramayana as Maricha, the Rakshas, who had changed himself into an antelope. As soon as he is killed by Rama's arrows, he is transferred to the heavens in the constellation of the seven antelopes, the Great Bear. It appears in the astronomy of the Akkadians that this constellation was the cradle of the year-God. We thus see that the ruler of this epoch was the archer-God.

(2) *The wounded Bhishma on the stretcher waiting for the Uttarayanam.*

The reckoning, in the year of Orion of the Deer-Sun-God, by weeks of five nights each, continued the same as before. The months were 12, and each month comprised 29 days as computed from night to night. It was the same month as that of the Hindu Karanas. It will be seen that this reckoning gave only  $29 \times 12$  or 348 days to the year. This computation, therefore, left 12 days wanting to make up the full tale of 360 days of the year. These 12 days were accounted for by the sleep of the Sun-God, prior to his death, the evidence as to which (the sleep) is extensive as will be shown below. This is the period of Aditya Sayana (or the Sun's sleep) described in the Puranas.

The Ribhus slept for 12 days in the house of Agūhya (that which cannot be concealed), the Pole-star. The totem dog of the fire worshippers awakened the Ribhus, at the end of this sleep, at the winter-solstice. This dog, as the year-dog, was sacrificed at the end of the year to make way for his successor.

This was the period of 12 days during which Thoas slept with his daughter, the Pole-star.

During 12 days and nights Argal, the Phoenician Sun-God, slept on the funeral pyre before he was recalled to life as the Sun-God of the new year on the 25th of December.

This incident is repeated in the Gilgames epic; after he received the wound from Ishtar, Gilgames lingered for 12 days before he died.

During that time he implored the Gods of the lower world to restore him to life. He rose again as the sun of the new year in the twelfth book of the poem to be the antelope or gazelle-Sun-God.

In the episode of Samvarana and Tapati, it is related that Samvarana (the rising sun) died for love of Tapati, the sun-maiden. He lay insensible for 12 days, at the end of which period he was recalled to life by Vasishtha, who united the reborn God to Tapati, the sun-maiden of the winter-solstice, and thus made him a year-Sun-God.

This year of Orion, according to the ritualistic measurement by months, began with the full-moon of Phalguna (February-March); but, as the Vedic year of the Ribhus, it began at the winter-solstice, as is clear from the relation that it was at the end of this year that the Ribhus slept for 12 days in the house of Aguhya.

The 12 days' sleep conclusively marks this year as that of three seasons, which closed with the 12 days' revel before the winter-solstice, ending with the death of the deer-Sun-God as in Scandinavia.

(3) *Was it due to accident that the Bharata was divided into 18 Books?*

Was it also an accident that the Akshauhini corps engaged in the great war were 18?

Was it also an accident that the great war lasted just 18 days, neither more nor less; and that the number of the generals who fought was 18.

[The latest achievement of Brahmin ritualism was the year of 18 months for sacrificial and liturgical purposes. Side by side, there was the popular year of 12 months observed by the nation at large. The 18 months year (Ritualistic) supplanted the 17 months Ritualistic year. Side by side with the 17 months Ritualistic year, there was a popular year of 12 lunar months. There were 21 days to each of the 17 months and 357 days in the year. The popular year reckoned  $364 \text{ days} = 13 \times 28$ .

The year of seventeen months, closing the exile of the Pandavas, ended before the Aswamedha of Yudhishthira in Chaitra. This year of eighteen months begins with his sacrifice. To suit the new ideas of reckoning, the ritual underwent some change. Eighteen sacrificial stakes were set up for the Gods of the year instead of eleven as in the earlier epochs. In addition, three stakes were required for the triangle enclosing the fire on the altar of animal sacrifices or only two by a variation of practice.

If two, the total number would be 20 to correspond with the number of days of a month of the 18 months' year, if three the number would be 21 corres-

ponding with the number of days of a month of the year of 17 months.

On the sacrificial ground a brick-altar was also built. It was 10 cubits long and 8 broad to make up the number 18 of the months.

This year of 18 months was ritualistic. It had 20 days to the month, divided into 4 weeks of 5 days each. This gave 72 weeks and 360 days to the year.

A requirement of conformity to the ritualistic formalism of the period underlay the 'accidental' division of the epic into 18 Books, the division of the combatants into 18 army corps, the progress of the war for 18 days, the number 18 of the generals who fought in the campaign, and the circumstance that Dhritarashtra, his queen, Kunti and Vidura lived just for 18 years after the great war before they were called up to heaven.

## APPENDIX II.

### DRAUPADI AND HER FIVE HUSBANDS.

#### CHAPTER I.

The reason why Draupadi was made to marry the five Pandava Brothers, together, is a mystery which cannot be solved, except on the supposition that the account must have been based on very strong tradition.

The earliest of the poets who had to do with the genesis of the Bharata was probably not far removed in time from the period when polyandry existed among the Indo-Aryans. The observation of Pandu, in his

colloquy with Kunti (Vide, Adiparva chapter 128, Dra-vida; chapter 122, Calcutta.) that monogamy was in his time a comparatively recent institution and that women were quite free in the olden days, probably reflects the poet's own knowledge of the past. To him or to his generation the idea of the marriage of Draupadi at the same time to five husbands, together, would not present any difficulty. He might not think of inventing the incident in that form, but, if that was the tradition handed down to his times, he should readily accept it, without questioning it, as he would perceive nothing odd or unnatural or improbable in the story. His knowledge of the past would have justified the tradition, and the generation to whom he addressed himself would easily accept it. The main story of the Bharata must have existed, in outline, long before it was put into epic form by the genius of a poet. The populace would have known it in some form. If they knew that Draupadi was married to one man, the poet dared not have said that she was married at one and the same time to five men.

The period of the heroes being pushed back to prehistoric epochs, even as a matter of invention, the poet would naturally copy the manners of the times in which the incidents were placed, to satisfy not only epic propriety but also the dictates of common sense. As generation succeeded generation, all recollection of by-gone customs and manners was lost. There came a time when the readers of the Bharata started questionings, for, the story did not accord with their knowledge of men or manners. A marriage like that of Draupadi was impossible in their times. They knew not that at



one time, however, it was practised. They were taught to regard the Pandavas and Draupadi as semi-divine. That being so, how were they to reconcile themselves to what, in their own time, would be regarded as an abomination and of which they never knew instances in usage or practice? The marriage laws observed by them were eternal and immutable and they believed that it was with their ancestors as it was with them. They believed that, in the period ascribed to the Bharata heroes also, the practices must have been the same as in their own times. How then could they reconcile Draupadi's marriage with the undoubted law and 'dharma' observed by their ancestors, which declared such a marriage impossible? The fact of the marriage however remained and they could not get over it. Some explanation had to be found for the strange occurrence and if none was available explanations had to be invented. The text would appear to have been revised, with the express design of raising the question for the purpose of answering it. This involved the addition of some chapters which, as usual in the Bharata, was easily done. We accordingly find it stated that the father of the princess was horrified when the revolting idea was first put into his head; that he repudiated the suggestion as one opposed to Vedic law and usage; that Vyasa and Yudhishtira both conceded this position, but tried to persuade him to believe that it was really a matter fore-ordained, which the Gods in their wisdom had decreed should come to pass and that therefore he should reconcile himself to it.

As the marriage was believed to have been opposed to the established usages of the period ascribed to the

heroes, and not justified by any law, precept or usage, it is apparent that the explanation could proceed only from one source, *i.e.*, the unknown, wherein lay the advantage that, if it was not capable of verification, neither was it capable of falsification. An appeal was therefore made to the theory of 'karma', of past births and predestinations. Explanations based on these ideas continued to be framed by different men in different ages. As each explanation was made ready it was given its proper place in the text. Each earlier explanation was superseded by a later, as each specialist felt that the existing version would not stand the test of criticism and that he might supplant it by a better one. As usual, we have all the interpolations placed together in the same canto, and to some extent, in the same chapter, for the benefit of the pious reader, who has been already told that his salvation is inseparably bound up with a study of the Bharata. The why and the wherefore of the polyandrous marriage of Draupadi, as recorded in the Bharata, is a very good instance of the concern exhibited by Bharata specialists for the improvement of the text, of the freedom with which they tampered with it, of the callousness they harboured towards the feelings or genius of the original poet and of the unblushing effrontery with which they packed together mutually contradictory accounts, on one and the same subject or topic, in the same or successive chapters.

## CHAPTER II.

The first attempt at a solution of the Draupadi mystery is contained in a chapter which is numbered 184 in the Dravida text, 171 in the Calcutta text and

169 in the Madras and Bombay copies. The matter in these several copies as to what is contained in these chapters is the same. After the Pandavas left Eka-chakrapuram, they fell in with a troop of way-farers and intended to go to some country where they could obtain an abundance of alms and of charitable gifts. They were advised to go to the country of Drupada. On the road Vyasa appeared to them, unexpectedly, and advised them to proceed to Drupada's Capital without delay as there was certain good fortune awaiting them there. He told them a story that "once upon a time, there lived a Brahmin maiden, the daughter of a Rishi; she was handsome and had good looks, but, as the result of past Karma, she was unlucky. She was not solicited in marriage, though good-looking. To right herself in the matter, she started Tapas, supplicating the great God Sankara. After some time the God was pleased to appear before her and to ask her what she wanted. The maiden said to him 'I want a husband endowed with all virtues'. This she repeated again and again. The God, thereupon, replied. 'Very well, thou shalt have five husbands'. But the girl felt ashamed, and protested, 'My lord! I ask for only one husband, if you please'. 'No' said the Lord, "Thou shalt have five, for thou didst ask for a husband five times. But it shall be when thou shouldst pass into another body" (*i.e.*, birth).

"That maiden is now born as the daughter of Drupada. She has been intended (by divine will) as your common wife. Go therefore to Drupada's capital, live there for a time, obtain the damsel and make yourselves happy".

This was the story told by Vyasa for the first time. Without intending any offence to Vyasa's reverence, this story may be well described as a cock and bull story. It is a tale that is most stupidly conceived.

I. Nothing is known about the time, place or parentage of the girl. Even her own name does not transpire. The matter appears to have been treated with singular indifference, as if from a foreknowledge that no body would take the tale seriously.

II. There is no reason to believe that the damsel should have repeated her prayer to the God five times. But if she did, the God might, as a matter of ordinary good sense, have allowed somewhat for her nervousness or trepidation, especially by reason of the suddenness of his appearance before her, so unexpectedly. He should have known that she was asking for only one husband. No man of woman born would, if he had been present at the scene, have made the mistake of supposing that she asked for five husbands. We need not appeal to Sankara's Omniscience as a God. If he were gifted with anything approaching ordinary human understanding, he should not have behaved as he did. It was not a period when polyandry was practised. The repetition of a request for one husband does not mean a plurality of husbands. The maiden was horror-struck and protested to his divinity, but without avail. For it was too much that the God should stand corrected by one who was of the earth and mortal.

III. It is not intelligible how the God came to say that the boon should take effect in the next birth, in future. The poor girl badly wanted a husband in

her present condition of flesh and blood. She never dreamt of another birth and felt no concern about it. She was not troubled as to whether or not she should be a wedded wife in a future birth. She did not make Tapas for husbands in a future life. The boon that she asked of Sankara was a husband in the present and not a future birth. What was the good of granting her the boon in the form in which it was given?

There was no condition attached to the boon that she should now know what she should be in her future birth, and that in her next birth she should know her identity in the previous existence.

A condition like that would establish to her knowledge a continuity of existence, known and undoubted, by reason of which, she might resignedly spend this life in expectation and the next in the happiness of fruition.

In the absence of any such knowledge, there is absolutely no good in a boon of this sort. The Rishi's daughter did not know that she would be reborn as Draupadi. The Princess did not know that she was a Rishi's daughter at one time, and that she got her five husbands now, because of the God's boon to herself; where then was the satisfaction for the Rishi's daughter?

IV. We are not told anything about the length of the time that elapsed between the period when the Rishi's daughter lived and the period when Draupadi was born.

It would be instructive to know this; nor are we told of the media through which the erst-while Rishi's

daughter contrived to be reborn as the Princess Draupadi; or how it came about that the Rishi's daughter, instead of taking her rebirth in the ordinary way, came to be born out of the blazing sacrificial fire, in full growth of flesh and blood, an incident which is nothing short of a miracle. And we are not told how a damsel, the daughter of a Rishi, against whom nothing had been stated to her detriment, and who should have acquired a higher spiritual essence by the discipline and travail of Tapas, should be reborn in a lower caste, though a ruling one.

The story was constructed to account for Draupadi having five husbands, but the correlative idea was lost sight of. For the story does not say why the Pandavas should submit to the rather inconvenient experience of having one wife in common. If the story was continued to the effect that there were also five young Rishis, who were not able to procure wives; that they made Tapas to the God for a wife; that, on the God appearing, they all of them cried out at the same time for a wife; that the God thereupon vouch-safed to them that they should all have one wife; that they protested and thereupon the God said that it should come to pass in the next-life, the story would not be as defective as we now find it, and probably would have dispensed with further efforts on the part of the Bharata specialists.

VI. Then, there is nothing in the conversation between the damsel and the God to show that the five husbands were to be so, one and all, at the same time and jointly. There is nothing against the construction that she was to have the five husbands one after another, *i.e.*, not more than one at a time.

VII. The story misses a vital point. There is no suggestion in the God's boon that the five husbands should be brothers. When the girl made Tapas and the God appeared to her, a marital connection like that of five brothers with a common wife was Ex Hypothesi incestuous. The God must have known it. Did he intend it to supervene? And did he give the damsel to understand as much?

### CHAPTER III.

The second explanation offered is contained in chapter 212 of the Dravida copy. This chapter and the next one, containing the third version, are found also in the Madras Edition, but are wanting in the other texts, so that these two chapters are an invention special to the southern Districts. Chapter 212 opens the story of a Nalayani. This is probably a tribal name. Her maiden name was Indrasena. She was a married woman, and the wife of a Rishi of the name of Maudgalya. He was afflicted with leprosy and yet the care and attention with which she nursed him, her austere devotion and her transcendental chastity, evoked the delight, gratitude and good wishes of the husband. One day he expressed himself highly gratified and asked her what he could do for her. She said:—"The carnal appetite is very strong in me (she was in prime womanhood). "If you can recover your proper form free from disease and consort with me, it is the one desire that is burning in me. Assume *five different and attractive forms* and in each form let me have your company" The Rishi assented: His leprosy would appear to have been unreal, and feigned to test the virtue of the woman.

They started the honeymoon to which however there does not appear to have been assigned any reasonable limitation. From place to place and from world to world they passed, still enjoying themselves in the way they started. The Rishi changed his form as often as was suggested by the humour or caprice of the woman. After the lapse of a considerable period of centuries and millenniums, the Rishi appears to have felt that some separation was desirable. He went into Tapas again.

This chaste woman, we are told, was reborn as Draupadi 'by some caprice of fortune or destiny'; hence her five husbands. But may we ask, why five?

I. This story is very unsatisfactory. The woman had her desires satisfied and she had more enjoyment of the nature that she wanted than would fall to the lot of any mortal woman, even in several incarnations. Why should she be reborn for starting again with five husbands instead of one? The story is rounded off with 'some caprice of fortune or destiny' not revealed.

II. Whatever may have been the hankering of the woman in this matter, it is not stated that the Rishi was so full of desire that it had to be satisfied in a second birth; and that in such birth he should multiply himself into five distinctive and dissimilar bodies? On the other hand, we find that the Rishi had tired of the new life and went into Tapas. This new life was not even of his seeking. It was forced on him by his wife. The story does not make any suggestion as to the connection between the Pandavas and the Rishi or between the Pandavas and Nalayani in the previous existence.

III. It does not appear that Nalayani begged the Rishi for a boon that she should have five husbands in some other birth. She requested the Rishi to assume five forms to please her. He did assume the five forms and several more. There was an end of that matter. Why should she be mated with five husbands in the next birth? It is clear therefore that this explanation falls far short of the requirements and leaves the secret of the five husbands unsolved. These and other difficulties which will be referred to later on must have been perceived very early, so that we have a third explanation offered, being an attempt to improve on the second. We find this third story in the next chapter, *i.e.*, 213 of the Dravida text. This chapter also is wanting in the other two texts. It is a second and revised version of the Nalayani story. Chapter 213 is not a continuation of 212, though an attempt has been made, by altering the head lines of chapter 213, to make it appear, at first sight, that it is a continuation of chapter 212. The story is told by Vyasa to Drupada and is to this effect. "I shall very gladly tell you the history of the previous incarnation of your daughter. Once on a time, there was a Nalayani of the name of Indrasena. She obtained for husband one Maudgalya and lived with him happily. Cycles after cycles rolled on and the pair had the best of the enjoyments of life. Thereupon, the Rishi felt that he had enough of the pleasures of youth and betook himself to divine meditation and Tapas, giving up all intercourse with his wife. He abandoned her to herself. She fell on the earth. But she was loath to part with him. She protested against his desertion and said she was not yet satisfied in the cravings of the flesh and he should not desert her in that way.

The Rishi cried out in indignation. 'In the land of men you shall take birth as the daughter of King Drupada. There you shall be the wife of five famous men and you can have your desires satisfied then by them'.

The first point to be noted is that, on desertion by the Rishi, Nalayani fell on the earth; why she should fall here unless dropped from the clouds is not apparent; and she must have belonged before that to a region other than this earth. Further, when the Rishi speaks of her future, he tells her she would be born in the world of men, showing that they must have been living in some other world and probably they belonged to some species other than of man. There is no doubt, however, that the Nalayani of the earlier chapter was of this Earth, as also the leper, her husband. The second point to be noted is that it was probably a curse that the Rishi pronounced on her in a fit of temper as a punishment to her for her insatiable desire. If that was so it is intelligible that it should have come to pass.

But it does not appear for what reason the unfortunate parents of Draupadi were predestined to submit to the humiliation of having to give away the bride at the same time to five husbands, one after another.

#### CHAPTER IV.

Let us proceed, Nalayani, after having been thus ill-used by her husband, was chagrined to find that the desires of the flesh were still unsatisfied. She made Tapas to Sankara who appeared before her and granted her boons. It is

probably a slip of the poet that we are not told what was the prayer she addressed to the God when he appeared to her. We find only what He said to her. Said the God :—‘ You shall be born again as a high-class woman. Five notable men shall be your husbands’.

We have now a repetition of number I version. The woman protested to the God against what she believed was his levity. He replied that it was due to the fact that she asked for a husband five times. She reasoned with him against the absurdity of the idea, but he was not open to conviction, notwithstanding the admonition that the provision for five husbands was, as pointed out by the woman, a thinly disguised form of approved prostitution.

The God assured her that after all it was not so bad as that, for there were days when there was no such thing as marriage, when woman was free to consort with whom-so-ever she chose and no taint attached to her.

The lady, having now got more than she wanted, was minded to make the best of it and said to the God that, if she was to have five husbands, she should have facilities for connubial gratification with each one of them; and that she should have the benefit of virginity at every start. This was granted to her, whatever was understood by it, on either side.

Let us examine this story.

I. This Nālayani we are told was of the name of Indrasena, and her husband was Maudgalya. This double of Maudgalya does not appear to have been a

leper, real or pretended; nor does this double of Nālayani appear to have ever been subjected to enforced celibacy, tribulation or discipline.

II. When the husband foretells her experience in the future birth, he assigns five husbands to her, but does not tell her the why and the wherefore of it.

He tells her who she is to be in that next birth. But he does not choose to tell who her five husbands are to be, though it is certain he should have known that too.

Why does he not tell her about them?

III. Why did she start Tapas? The advent of Sankara does not appear to have resulted in an amelioration of her condition; it stood, after his visit, just where it stood before. His prophesy was the same as that of the Rishi. In one respect it was not quite so informing.

IV. The Rishi told her she would be born a Princess, as the daughter of King Drupada. The God does not give at least this information and makes no suggestion as to who her husbands in the future birth are to be. He adds, however, that in her future form she would do a great deal for the ‘cause’ of the celestials, whatever that was.

V. The real point is missed any how. What was the Tapas for? Why should she have gone through it? It was because Nālayani, the discarded wife of Maudgalya, was not satisfied with the promise made to her by her husband of future happiness in a re-incarnation. She was full of youth and life. She wanted

satisfaction as Nalayani in the body that engendered the appetite. If the Tapas could not procure that much for her, but gave promise of some thing to come after the extinction of this life, that was of very little comfort to her, and it did not improve her position in the least.

In the first cast of Nalayani's story, the mutual attachment of the spouses was great, and having had an extraordinary degree of felicity, both desisted from carnal knowledge, though they did not part company. No trace of a voluptuous desire appears to have been left in the woman. They developed a sort of Platonic love:—

एकपत्नी तदा भूत्वा सदैवाग्रे यशस्विनी  
अरुन्धतीव सीतेव बभूवातिपतिव्रता.  
तस्मिंस्तस्यामनस्तत्कम् नचचाल कदाचन  
तथा प्रणिहितोह्यात्मा तस्यास्तास्मिन् द्विजोत्तमे.

'True to her man, she always sat in his presence, as chaste and faithful as Arundhati or Sita. Her mind stuck to him and could not in any way be shaken; so completely were her affections concentrated in that best of Brahmins'.

It is clear from the above that the woman was single-minded, high-souled and strongly attached to him. No intemperate or immodest desire, nothing sensual was left in her.

He was minded to abjure carnal pleasures. She readily agreed and they lived together in great amity. Her fondness for him was so great that to the last she

was faithful in her mind to him. Where was the occasion for a lustful incarnation? What was the connection between Maudgalya and the Pandus or between his wife and Draupadi? How can this story account satisfactorily for the five husbands of Draupadi? On the other hand, every suggestion in the story points to the contrary. As an attempt to account for the plurality of consorts it was an utter failure. The revisers of the text were not slow to perceive this. They decided that the story required alteration and it was altered at once.

So that, in the second story connected with the name of Nalayani, we find that:—

(a) after a time the *husband* felt disgusted with satiety but *she* did not feel so.

(b) He attempts Tapas, she attempts to frustrate it.

(c) He is incensed. He regards her as a woman with low instincts. He foretells that she shall have five husbands, though in the next birth, when she would be the daughter of King Drupada.

There is no promise or suggestion here that he himself would be reincarnated as the five Pandus and that then she should have satisfaction in full. This story, therefore, is not a continuation of the previous chapter. It is a contradictory story, devised to supersede the earlier one, and designed to account more satisfactorily for the five husbands. How far it has succeeded that way is another question.

In the second tale, after the narration that Nalayani ceased to live with her husband and went away to

make Tapas, the rest of the story is copied from No. I version, given in chapter 184, as noted above. But this was done without a correct appreciation of the difference between the two cases. In chapter 184 the woman was unmarried when she made Tapas. Whether she got her husband or husbands in that life or in the next, it would be her first experience in matrimony. In the case of Nalayani she was a married woman. It is necessary to bear this in mind. The ideas common to Puranic writers and poets, who have generally done little more than follow the inclination of the lay mind, must be taken note of. A passage in Magha's *Sisupala-vadha* puts the idea clearly and correctly :—

सतीव योषित् प्रकृतिस्सुनिश्चला पुमांसमभ्येति भवान्तरेष्वपि.

'The qualities of a man, good or bad, attach to him in his next life, just as his wife, being chaste, does'.

The next life is but a continuation of the present one. The great desire of a chaste woman is that, throughout all her future incarnations, she should be the wife of the same man in his future forms. When Rama discarded Sita and sent her away, according to popular belief, it was for her being killed. Lakshmana was commissioned to do it. He was unwilling. But he had to obey. During the interval allowed for meditation, before the sword was unsheathed, the prayer of Sita was that throughout all her future births she should be the wife of Rama. If Rama reappeared as Krishna, Sita was by his side again as Rukmini. It is not only love and friendship that are linked together, for better or for worse, through the never-ending cycles of transmigration ; active hostility also has had the same result. Vishnu, the lord of the hosts, had his enemies and they

were as constant in harassing him as his admirers were in supporting him, through his several incarnations. As Nara and Narayana he was opposed by Hiranyāksha and Hiranyakasipu. As Rama and Lakshmana by the same individuals, reappearing as Ravana and Kumbhakarna. As Krishna and Bala, he was opposed by Sisupala and Dantavakra. Puranic romances are never tired of tracing back their heroes and heroines to prior existences.

It may be that Nalayani had an extraordinary appetite, but all the same she was a chaste woman. She was not a lewd woman. She never had any desire to consort with any person other than her husband. The Rishi never thought otherwise about her than that she was chaste, though she had an inordinate desire. If she went into Tapas it must have been for the purpose of winning back the affections of her present husband, not only for this but also for other births. It can be only a degrading idea on the part of the poet that could devise the story of Nalayani asking for another husband, or of delighting in other husbands. An idea like that is certainly not one that would have crossed the mind of the earliest poet who was associated with the Bharata. There is no hint and no suggestion that Maudgalya was later multiplied into the five Pandus. This should not have been wanting if this outstanding feature of the case had been present to the mind of the poet who stood sponsor for this episode. To represent Nalayani as other than chaste, in act or thought, is not consistent with the character that has been assiduously sought to be established for Draupadi in the Bharata, throughout which she is represented as a paragon of virtue. If it were not for the purpose of reclaiming the



same husband to bed and board, Nalayani need not have made any Tapas.

The basic notion of the Nalayani fable, as conceived by the poet, appears to be that the woman was very lascivious and in the next birth, by accident or design, she had five husbands. The implication is that we should treat them as cause and effect. This idea is certainly not complimentary to the heroine, Draupadi. And it will not bear scrutiny. This idea of the poet, if correct, was not followed up in the rest of the Bharata. For, the advantage sought to be secured by the plurality of consorts would be available only in case she had freedom of movement with all the five of them day after day. But this was not the case. As soon as convenient, her conjugal relations with her husbands were subjected to strict regulation, under the advice of Narada, as the result of which she stood no better than she should have done in a monogamous union. It is difficult to believe that the original poet or poets intended to represent Draupadi as a woman of vulgar passions and lewd desires.

And, after all, neither of the versions has made it clear how the Rishi's daughter or Nalayani was changed into Draupadi. The rebirth, known and implied, is always in the ordinary way, of woman born. But that is not how Draupadi was ushered into existence. At the end of a sacrifice, performed by Drupada, out of the sacrificial fire, simultaneously with the last oblation that fed the flaming fire, the lady came out a full-grown virgin, on the threshold of womanhood, with ample breasts and other indications of adult growth. The missing link has not been supplied. How, when and

by whom, was this metamorphosis of Nalayani determined on and carried out? Where and when did the council of the everlasting Gods meet to decide on this miraculous birth? Whether good or bad, if this Nalayani fable formed part of the original plan, this link would not be missing.

The Nalayani episode is far from being satisfactory in itself. It exists in the southern copies only. It is wanting in the Bombay and Calcutta editions. A reference to the Parva Sangraha makes it clear that this Nalayani episode is an interpolation. We find, in the Parvasangraha of all the editions, mention of Panchendropakhyanam as narrated to Drupada to satisfy him as to the propriety of the proposed marriage of Draupadi to five husbands. There is no mention of Nalayani's episode. We may, therefore, reject this upakhyanam as false and spurious, without any hesitation.

## CHAPTER V.

The Chapter next following, *i.e.*, 214, in the Dravida copy, is found in all the other texts as chapter 197:—

It is named Panchendropakhyanam or the story of the five Indras. It was designed to account for the five husbands of Draupadi being brothers. The story is to this effect, and narrated by Vyasa to Drupada, the father of Draupadi.

(1) Once upon a time the celestials entered on a sacrificial session, which was expected to take a long time to finish. Yama or Pluto was acting as Samita, (the priest who kills and skins the victims). He was not able to look after his usual duties of putting an end

to the lives of mortals whose time had expired. The result was that there was no death among men ; and it looked almost as though they would claim equality with the immortals.

The latter, however, did not like the turn that events were taking. They appealed to Brahma, the creator, for help, advice and comfort. The God assured them 'that they had nothing to fear or to resent. The cessation of mortality among men was only temporary, as Yama was otherwise engaged. As soon as he resumed his legitimate work, the old state of things would be restored and the immortals might rest in peace'.

(2) The aggrieved Gods were thus comforted and their king, the Indra, was on one occasion sauntering about on the banks of the Ganges. He heard the cries of a woman who was in the midst of the water in the river. The woman was weeping. The tears rolled down hot and fast and he observed that each tear-drop as it fell into the water of the river changed into a golden lotus. The King of the Gods questioned the woman as to who she was and what she was weeping for. She said "you know very well who I am and what I am weeping for". "And yet, if you care, you can follow me and verify for yourself." So saying, she led the way and he followed her. They walked on until they found themselves in the presence of one who looked like a youthful God playing a game at dice with a Goddess on the top of a hill.

The king of the Gods was enraged to see this youthful God pretending indifference to his own pre-

sence, and cried out to him to say that he (the youthful God) should know what he owed to his betters and learn to improve his manners. The youthful God pursued his game without minding what was said or betraying the least concern. He took his own time in which to finish the game; and, when that was done, the youthful God turned towards the weeping lady and directed her to lead the Indra nearer to him, as he wished to teach him a lesson that would purge him of his arrogance. The woman touched the person of the Indra, intending to lead him by the hand. But on the instant the Indra fell down at his full length and prostrate as if struck by lightning.

Then the youthful God of dazzling brilliance said to the Indra, 'Beware, Indra; that you do not behave here-after as you did just now. Come hither, remove this huge boulder that conceals a passage into the heart of the mountain'.

The Indra did so and when he looked into the passage he found at the farther end four individuals of magnificence and majesty equalling his own.

He feared (to enter) lest he should share the same fate. Then the great God, Iswara, looked scornfully at the Indra and addressed him in these words. 'Thou of a hundred sacrifices get into this cavern, for thou hast dared to slight me because of my youth'. So directed, the Indra trembled from head to foot and, folding his hands in humble submission, found language to say—'Lord, hereafter be thou the undisputed master of the universe, first and foremost'.

The great God heard this and smiled. He was pleased in his mind.

He said "You shall not keep long here. Get in and sleep there for a space. These that you see here were like you before. This lady here shall be the wife of all of you. You shall all enter into the wombs of mortal women. As men you shall accomplish valorous deeds, slaying the enemies of the Gods. You shall then come back to your pristine glory—the glory of Indra-lokam. I have spoken all this. It is pre-destined and it shall come to pass." Then spoke the four superseded Indras:—

"We shall go down to the land of men. Let the Gods, Dharma, Vayu, Indra, and the two Aswins beget us on a human mother."

The latest of the Indras also added—"As I cannot go down there, myself, by reason of my office, I shall beget a son to make a fifth with the others."

"The great God was pleased to grant their requests. And that lady, who was the incarnation of the majesty and glory of the Indras, the God ordained should be their wife in the world of men."

"Then they all went up to Narayana (Vishnu) and reported what all had happened."

"They asked for his help and countenance. He was glad to co-operate. Two hairs he pulled out, from his head, one was white, the other was black. These hairs found their way into the wombs of two Yadava ladies, Devaki and Rohini; Devaki gave birth to Krishna, the dark one, and Rohini to Balarama, the fair one."

"The superseded Indras are born as the Pandavas with Arjuna as the representative of the regnant Indra.

And their majesty, the majesty of Indra-ship, is transformed into the princess Draupadi. How, otherwise, O King! should a woman come up from the bowels of the earth."

The whole of the story as given above is in archaic metre and manner. In places the sense is obscure for want of the full complement of words. The grammatical structure in places is not what all could be desired. That this chapter was a genuine attempt to account for the five husbands of Draupadi and for Draupadi herself appears clearly. The outstanding feature of the five husbands being brothers has been kept in mind. Hence their birth is deduced from the five Indras. To satisfy other proprieties it is found that Draupadi was associated with all the five Indras, one after another, as the Royalty of the Indras. With the help of grammar in providing the feminine gender and a figure of speech which converts the abstract into the concrete, this Royalty of the Indras becomes a divine bride, and follows the Indras into the world of men as their common wife, Draupadi.

This fable has a great deal more to recommend it than the story of Nalayani. We may be thankful, for being relieved from the necessity to impute pruriency to Draupadi in her past or present forms, in the attempt to account for her five husbands.

Why the lady at the river was found weeping or crying is not made clear; was it because her lovers, the Indras, were incarcerated; or was it because the immortality of the Gods virtually ceased to be a boast, as the mortals were in a fair way to compete with them on their own ground?

Another thing that is not clear in this chapter is the connection, which we are not able to see, between the story of the sacrifice at Naimisharanya on the one hand and the weeping lady on the other. That portion might be cut out without affecting the story of the Indras in the least.

It is difficult to determine the chronological sequence of these interpolations. The story of the Indras, as being more in harmony with the main feature of the case, has thrown into the shade the story of Nalayani, on the probable ground of the survival of the fittest; and the fact remains that, whereas the story of the Indras is common to all the copies, that of Nalayani is not known except in the Dravida text. But the southern copies, it is apparent, would not give up what was invented for their benefit.

It is probable that these several fables were compositions, independent of each other, and of different periods. The specialists as usual found it easy to cento them into the Bharata, regardless of an out-crop of contradictions.

## CHAPTER VI.

It will be useful to compare the Sanskrit version of the Panchendropakhyanam with the Telugu translation. The latter makes it very probable that the story, as it stood, at the time of the Telugu author which was the early part of the eleventh century A. D., differed materially from what it is now. The Telugu translator had before him the Dravida text. That was the text he used. Accordingly, we find him assimilating the Nalayani story and then linking it up with the Panchen-

dropakhyanam, as we find done in the Dravida text. But there are important differences requiring notice. The story as presented in the Telugu is to this effect:— 'The Rishi left Nalayani to herself and entered into Tapas; after a time, he was gathered to his fathers. But Nalayani's carnal desires were not satisfied. She pined away in silence and in time went the way of all flesh.

(a) 'She was reborn as the daughter of a Kshatria of the name of Kasiraja and grew up to womanhood, without being solicited in marriage. She was sorely distressed and made Tapas to Sankara for obtaining a husband.

(b) 'While she was making Tapas, each one of the Gods, Dharma, Vayu, Indra and the twin Aswins, went to her, severally, and requested her to become the wife, in another birth, of sons who should be born to each of them.

(c) "And for a long time she made Tapas. The God Sankara appeared to her and she asked him, in eager supplication, five times, for a husband. The God took pity on her, and said 'you shall have five husbands in another birth'. She protested. But the God would not recall his word. He then sent her on an errand. "Go to the river" said the God to her, "you will find the Indra there, bring him hither unto me." She had to wait good long before the Indra turned up there."

(d) Here follows the story of the sacrificial session in the Naimisha forest, where-at Dharma (Pluto) is stated to have been the Dikshit.

(e) When the Indra went with the weeping woman into the presence of Iswara, the Telugu represents the latter as being in the likeness of Varuna (Poseidon). The Sanskrit text has the word Taruna (youthful). It is probable that, in the copy of the Bharata used by the Telugu poet, there was a clerical error, and relying on his copy the Telugu author has rendered it as Varuna.

But it is not possible to explain the other variations on this footing. These could have resulted only from a different version. In the Sanskrit text of the Dravida copy we do not find any mention of Nalayani taking rebirth as the daughter of one Kasiraja and making Tapas as such. Wherefrom the Telugu author obtained this incident about Kasiraja's daughter does not appear.

This Kasiraja's daughter grew up as a 'maid not vendible'. She was ashamed of her condition and made Tapas. When she was so engaged, Dharma, Vayu, Indra and the Aswins went to request her that she should be the wife in another birth of sons who were to be born to them. Why they were so particular in respect of this woman, whom nobody on this planet cared to take for a wife is not clear. And why were they so anxious to provide a wife for sons yet unborn? As yet, it was not determined that sons should be born of them in the world of man, nor was the function ascertained which such sons were to perform. The Telugu records that Dharma and the other Gods interviewed the damsel severally, not all at the same time, but one after another. If that was so, each God could not have known that the other would be making a similar request

to the lady, and no God of them could have foreseen that she would be the common wife of five men. When the request was made to the lady by each God, how did she understand it? Did she know that it might result in her being the common wife of five men at the same time, and, if so, did she agree in spite of that knowledge? If she had no such consciousness, what was her understanding as to how the scheme was to be worked out? When was she to be the wife of Dharma's son, when the wife of Vayu's son and so on. If it was not to be in some sort of succession, why did she not tell the second God who approached her, that he was too late as she had already promised to be the wife of Dharma's son? If some such adjustment, as that mentioned above, was contemplated how did she become the common wife of five husbands. On the other hand, we are not told that, previous to visiting her, these Gods had all met together and discussed the matter among themselves, or that they had any knowledge that their services would be required in the near future to beget children on mortal women; or that they must now set about to provide a wife in advance for those to be born hereafter? How did they happen to think of this particular woman, each God, of this identical woman, and for a similar purpose, if there was no common understanding among them, previous to interviewing her? If there was some such understanding, they must also have determined that their future sons should have a common wife, without any apparent reason therefor and without leaving the matter to the good sense or the good taste of the future bridegrooms. These Gods themselves had not a common wife, at least in the divine world. These questions do not find

their answer in the text. This incident, about the request preferred by Dharma and the other Gods, is not found in the Sanskrit. It could not have been otherwise, for the copies extant know nothing of Kasiraja's daughter.

This incident about Kasiraja's daughter is a further invention. Somebody seems to have thought that, if Nalayani was the *wife* of a *Brahmin* Rishi and she made Tapas, it was not possible to make her the common wife of five Kshatriya Princes. She was, therefore, first metabolised into a Kshatriya girl as Kasiraja's daughter and then left as a maid, so that there might be no impropriety in the future alliances proposed. For, if she were married and chaste, the obligation to revert as the spouse of the same man in his future incarnations would attach, and it would amount technically to adultery for her to marry others. It should be borne in mind that this proceeding of Dharma, Vayu and the others must have found its place in the Telugu author's Sanskrit copy, as appears from the context, in the Nalayani portion and not in the chapter about the five Indras. In the latter chapter we find some mention of the Gods, „Dharma &c., but for a different purpose. When the superseded Indras were directed to incarnate themselves in the world of man, they requested the great God to give orders that Dharma, Vayu, the Indra and the Aswins should beget them on mortal women. That is all. The conclusion cannot be avoided that the Sanskrit copy used by the Telugu poet differed, in the matter of this upakhyanam, materially from the copy we now possess.....

## CHAPTER VII.

Chapter 214 does not close where the story of the five Indras ends. There are two or more paragraphs in the Dravida copy before the chapter is finished. Of these the first purports to be a precedent, recalling an ancient instance of a polyandrous marriage, already cited by Yudhishtira to Drupada and recorded in chapter 211 of the Dravida text. We are told that a monarch of old time of the name of Nitantu had five sons; they all had a common wife, and each one of them had children by her, individually ascribed to him. This paragraph is marked as doubtful in the Dravida copy and is wanting in the Calcutta and other texts. But it existed in the Sanskrit copy of the Telugu author. The next paragraph is found in all the editions. It is the last of the chapter. It furnishes a very opportune and excellent instance of the methods of Bharata specialists. It is a copy of the story of a Rishi's daughter, who could not procure a husband and therefore made Tapas, given in chapter 184 of the Dravida text and chapter 171 of the Calcutta and chapter 169 of the Bombay and Madras Editions. The language of this portion of chapter 184 has been altered in this copy, here and there, by paraphrase, to make the reader feel, at least in the first instance, that it is something different, and not the earlier chapter copied out. Why it was repeated will presently appear. According to this chapter, this Rishi's daughter, who once upon a time made Tapas and got a boon from the great God that she should have five husbands, was reborn as Draupadi. What connection this story has with that of Nalayani is not easily perceived. To provide that connection some lines have been interpolated by the Dravida com-

plers identifying this maid with Nalayani, wife of Maudgalya.

Again, the connection between this story and that of the five Indras is not apparent. To provide this connection there are two lines at the end. According to these lines, this Rishi's daughter was स्वर्गश्रीः or 'the glory of the celestial world', born at some period in human form, in which form she made Tapas and was reborn as Draupadi, intended as consort for all the five Pandus.

In order to correctly appreciate the attempt to concatenate these several fables, it is necessary to understand the plan on which the compilers proceeded.

The first time that the explanation is started about the five husbands of Draupadi is in chapter 184 of the Dravida copy. There it is 'once upon a time,' place not known; person, Rishi's daughter. This story was given to the Pandavas by Vyasa when the former were on their road to Drupada's country.

Subsequently, when Draupadi was won at the tourney by Arjuna, and Yudhishtira demanded her in marriage for all the five brothers, the considerations set out by him did not show any foreknowledge on his part of events or that he had any thing said to him by Vyasa on the matter. He should have, certainly, put himself on a better footing with Drupada, when the discussion started, if he had appealed to the information imparted to him so early by Vyasa.

After the discussion started as to the propriety of the suggested course of wedding the Princess to five husbands, Vyasa turned up there, unexpectedly, for the

purpose of supporting the request of the Prince. He might have told Drupada that he had already explained the situation to the Pandavas and that he had only to repeat to the King what he had said to these Princes already. The fact that Vyasa did not tell the King, as suggested above, throws suspicion on the genuineness of the inclusion in chapter 184 of this episode. But, if this story really formed part of chapter 184 in the first instance, then it is conceivable that, if Vyasa wished the Pandavas to believe that the reading of the past or the future which he had given to them was at all true, that was the only story he could repeat again to Drupada. The story related in chapter 184 of the Rishi's daughter was, therefore, repeated to Drupada by Vyasa in his interview. That is why we find it a second time at the close of what is now the Panchendropakhyanam. We may be safe in the surmise that this must have been the way in which the matter was dealt with, when it was first thought of. Additions came in subsequently, the story of Nalayani as given in the first instance, the story of the same lady as rewritten and the story of the five Indras, in conclusion.

All these were represented as having been narrated by Vyasa. This creates inconsistency and absurdity. To remove the incongruity of presenting varying and contradictory explanations, it was thought expedient to make some pretence of representing the series as the history of one and the same individual in different stages of repeated existences. This was done in the Dravida copy, in which alone we find the Nalayani story. The first version of this story, as originally contemplated, was closed in chapter 212. We are told towards the end:—

सावै नालायनी जज्ञे दैवयोगेन केनचित्  
राजंस्तवात्मजा कृष्णा वेद्याम् तेजस्विनी शुभा.

“And that Nalayani was born as your daughter, O King, out of the sacrificial fire, by *some* divine agency.” The story ended here. But the persons responsible for the second story of Nalayani wished to pass it off as a continuation of the above. This was sought to be achieved by the head lines of the second story, (chapter 213).

द्रुपद उवाच

ब्रूहि तत्कारणम् येन ब्रह्मन्नालायनी शुभा  
जाता ममाध्वरे कृष्णा सर्ववेदविदाम् वर.

Drupada—“Reverend Sir and best of those learned in the Vedas, please tell me how that good woman, Nalayani, came to be born in my sacrifice, as (my daughter) Krishna.”

Vyasa: “Listen, O, King; How the God Rudra gave her boons, and what for the renowned lady took birth in your house. Very gladly shall I tell you the history of your daughter in the past birth.”

“In ancient times, there was a good woman, a Nalayani, named Indrasena. She obtained as her husband Maudgalya, with whom she enjoyed life prosperously, free from cares and anxieties.”

[What follows is entirely contradictory as already stated of what is recorded in the previous chapter.] If Nalayani's second story were a continuation of the matter in chapter 212, it should be started by Vyasa from the point where he left it before. Compilers

might arrange the presentation of a story in several chapters or cantoes &c., but, as each chapter starts, the preamble is not repeated. Where was the need for Vyasa to say in the continuation:—

“In ancient times there was a good woman, a Nalayani of the name of Indrasena. She had Maudgalya for her husband &c.” Much argument is not needed to show that this sort of introduction is found only where the story is started for the first time. It implies that, as yet, the person addressed had not been introduced to Nalayani and Maudgalya of the story, that he did not know of their connection and so on. A text like this is impossible, where, in the earlier chapter, the person addressed had been told all that is now contained in these lines and more.

## CHAPTER VIII.

The two Nalayani chapters, having been linked together as above it only remained to connect the Panchendropakhyanam with Nalayani's. This was done in the closing lines of the second chapter of the Nalayani fable. (Chapter 213).

गच्छ गंगाजलस्थां नरम् पश्यसि यं शुभे  
तमानय ममाभ्यासम् सुरराजम् शुचिस्मिते  
इत्युक्ता विश्वरूपेण रुद्रम् कृत्वा प्रदक्षिणम्  
जगाम गंगामुद्दिश्य पुण्याम् त्रिपथगाम् नदीम्

The God then said to Nalayani.

“Go now, to the river. Get into the water, and from there you shall see a male, the king of the celestials. Bring him unto me. So directed, she went to



the river." The reader is left to understand that Nalayani is the person who was found in the river weeping, and who took the Indra into the presence of the God where the latter was playing a game at dice with his Goddess. That the weeping woman was not Nalayani can be easily made out from the Panchendrôpakhyanam.

1. The story of Nalayani does not disclose the place to which she belonged or the place where she made the Tapas. She did not go where the God was. But the God went up to her. Where did the God stand when he gave the direction to Nalayani? How did she know whither she was to lead the king of the celestials?

2. If Nalayani was the woman in the river, there was no reason why she should have been weeping, just after she had received all her boons from the great God, after her Tapas was over and she had the permission of the God to go, who even noticed a smile on her lips at parting and complimented her on the same.

3. The tears of the weeping woman, as fast as they fell into the waters of the river, were changed into lotus flowers of gold. This was somewhat of a miracle. Nalayani could not have achieved this. The great honour to which she was admitted, of a brief conversation with the creator of the universe, did not bring about in her case any apotheosis. She continued as a mortal woman. And in the next birth also, though she should have five husbands, she was to be their common wife as a mortal woman. If she were less than a Goddess, she could not have caused this miracle about the golden flowers, though it is not quite clear that even Goddesses could have caused this easily.

4. When the woman was asked by the Indra who she was and what she was weeping for, the reply given was to the effect that '*he knew* who she was and what she was weeping for.'

Now this is quite false if the weeping lady were Nalayani. For she did not know the Indra or that he knew anything of her distress; and he did not know her, nor did he know what her distress was. It is conceivable that, if the weeping woman were स्वर्गश्रीः Swarga Srih, she was known to the Indra. The weeping one also added that, if he followed her to her place, he would know all about the reason of her distress. This suggestion can have reference only to the fact appearing in the sequel of the incarceration of the ancient Indras. This incident was not known to Nalayani, and in no way concerned her. It was certainly known to स्वर्गश्रीः, Swargasrih. The weeping one suggested to the king of the Gods that he should follow her *to her place*. What was her place? Was it Nalayani's place? Was it the place where she made Tapas or the place where her husband stayed? But the Indra was not taken to either of these localities.

5. She was the messenger of the God. She was sent on an errand as Jove might send Athena or Hebe or Iris. She was not charged with any secrecy about it. It was not an errand of which she need have been ashamed, nor should she be unwilling to own that she was there to summon him in the name of the great God. There was no occasion for decoying the Indra under false pretences. It was not a summons which, when delivered, any celestial, however high his place, could have disobeyed. Why did she not then tell the Indra

straight-way what transpired or prepare him by hint or suggestion to meet the great one?

6. If it were Nalayani who took the Indra there, as soon as they were in the God's presence, she should have announced that she brought the person wanted and taken leave to depart. She does neither. She was not directed to wait on the God. Why does she continue to stand there in the presence and not go her way? What was her further concern?

7. When the Indra addressed the insolent speech to the great God, she should have known it was due to a mistake which the Indra may have to rue grievously; she should have felt that she was herself to blame, as she had not told the Indra that he was wanted by the great God, into whose presence she was taking him. Why did she not set the Indra right?

8. When the woman went out from the God's presence to do what she was directed to, he was there all alone. By the time that she returned, the Goddess was there with him.

Some surprise on the part of the woman was natural, if she were Nalayani. Some prostration, some genuflection, to show her reverence to the great mother of the universe and of the Gods, was to have been expected. But we do not find any such thing.

9. If this woman were Nalayani, Indrasena, how is it that her name is not for once mentioned in the whole of this chapter? Nor are we told in the Nalayani chapters anything about the prior incarnation of Nalayani as that she was a Goddess who had been ordained to pass some days in human form.

The chapter speaks of the lady, simply, as 'that stri', or 'the stri' and the author had no name to give her.

But the language used here and there clears up any difficulty as to her identity.

ताम् चाप्येषाम् योषितम् लोककान्ताम्  
श्रियम् भार्याम् व्यदधान्मानुषेषु.

"And that woman of singular beauty, who was their Royalty (majesty or glory) he made their wife in the world of men."

There is another verse.

एवमेते पाण्डवास्संबभूवुः  
ये ते राजन् पूर्वमिन्द्रा बभूवुः  
लक्ष्मी श्रैषाम् पूर्वमेवोपदिष्टा  
भार्या यैषा द्रौपदी दिव्यरूपा .

"And thus the Pandavas have come into being here.—These that were Indras before now.—And this lady of divine appearance who is now Draupadi; is the majesty of the Indras, already fore-ordained as their wife here."

When Vyasa ended his story of the five Indras, he offered to show the divine forms of the Indras and of the lady to Drupada. For this purpose he endowed the King with a magical vision—a sort of second sight.

The King then saw the originals of the five Pandavas. The Indras in all their divine glory—and he saw the lady also in her divine form, as she stood at the interview between the great God and the five Indras.

ताम् चैवाय्याम् स्त्रियमतिरूपयुक्ताम्  
 दिव्याम् साक्षात् सोमवह्निप्रकाशाम्  
 योग्याम् तेषाम् रूपतेजोयशोभिः  
 पत्नीम् मत्वा दृष्टवान् पार्थिवेन्द्रः

‘And that woman, the foremost of her sex, most beautiful of form, divine, of the radiance of Fire or the Moon—he (Drupada) considered to be a very fitting consort to them, corresponding in form, and splendour and brightness.’

This certainly is not the portraiture of Nalayani.

10. And lastly, this chapter about the five Indras begins in all the editions in such a way as to leave no doubt that it has no connection whatever with the previous chapter.

There is no reason therefore to suppose that the woman of the five Indras had anything to do with Nalayani. The two are two different creations.

### CHAPTER IX.

As stated above, the third paragraph of the Panchendra chapter repeats the story of the daughter of a Rishi. At the proper end of the paragraph some lines appear to have been added in the Dravida text which are wanting in the others and are marked as doubtful in the Dravida copy. In these lines we are told that the Rishi's maiden daughter of no name, no time and no place became Nalayani, that Maudgalya was her husband and that she obtained boons from Iswara.

This implies that in one birth the maiden daughter of the Rishi made Tapas and got her boons. That she

then became Nalayani and again made Tapas for the same boons and obtained them. So that, if this Nalayani were to be identified with Swargasrih, it cannot be in the form of Nalayani, as suggested in the connecting link of the Dravida text in the closing lines of the story of Nalayani. It can only be done by saying that the Rishi's daughter with whom we start was an incarnation of this “Swarga Srih.” But it has not been stated anywhere that the Rishi's daughter was the avatar of Swarga Srih, with the unenviable experience, that she could not procure a husband for her earthly life even by Tapas. But why should the Royalty of the Indras have been born as that luck-less maiden? The Telugu author followed the Dravida copy as it stood in his time. At the end of the Panchendropakhyanam he found it difficult to understand the connection between the story of the Rishi's daughter and that of Nalayani or the Swargasrih. It was quite a new story. He was probably struck with the absurdity of these inventions and got out of the difficulty in the best way possible, that is, by ignoring this last passage altogether.

The attempt to piece together the several narratives, inclusive of the Telugu, gives a story which it is impossible to justify.

We must take it that the name-less maiden daughter of a Rishi made Tapas for a husband, and got promise of five husbands for a future birth.

She then becomes Indrasena (Nalayani) and marries Maudgalya. As the wife of this Rishi, she makes Tapas again and is again promised five husbands for a future birth.

This Nalayani is afterwards reborn as the daughter of one Kasiraja. Not able to procure a husband, she makes Tapas for one and is promised five husbands in a future birth.

We have to tack on to the above the story of स्वर्गश्रीः.

Now, assuming the above sequence to hold, Draupadi, *alias* स्वर्गश्रीः *alias* Kasiraja's daughter, *alias* Indrasena, *alias* nameless Rishi-daughter, should have had twenty husbands instead of five only, on the logic of the justification pleaded by the God, when he granted the boon of five husbands in response to a prayer for one.

The wonder is that all these tales are fathered on Vyasa not only in his capacity as the author of the Bharata but as one of the Dramatis Personæ. He meets the Pandavas on their way to Drupada's capital and tells them the story of the Rishi's daughter.

He afterwards turns up at the Court of Drupada to give him justifications for marrying Draupadi to five husbands. He gives the story of Nalayani and then of the five Indras and then of the Rishi's daughter.

Stories mutually contradictory. The whole of this episode is a compendium of independent interpolations of various periods. There is hardly a portion of the Bharata that is free from a reproach of this kind.

It is singular that it did not occur either to Drupada or to Vyasa or to Kunti to consult the convenience or the inclination of the Princess. And yet, she was an adult virgin. Is it human or probable that a marriage like this should have been arranged without its being

put to her for her approval. Such a thing would not be possible even in the case of a professional harlot.

And it is conceded by all concerned, Drupada or Vyasa or Kunti or Yudhishtira, that, in the period to which the parties belonged, this sort of marriage was an abomination, opposed to the Vedas of the Gods, the Smritis of the Rishis, the usages of Society, and unknown in practice. The marriage of the Pandavas must therefore be traced to a period when such marriages were possible, and practised, not infrequently.

### CHAPTER X.

In course of time, when the study of the Bharata became a favourite pursuit, lay minds started questionings about incidents in the Epic which did not come natural to them. The Initiated had the right and the privilege to expound.

The Puranas were often employed for adding to, subtracting from, or varying the contents of the Bharata and the Ramayana; and this was done, with more or less impudence, as suited the temperament of the particular proxy of Vyasa or as the occasion allowed. The Markandeyapurana, as its preamble shows, was written with the avowed purpose of dispelling doubts, which had been entertained by readers in general, with respect to some of the events recorded in the Bharata. Draupadi's marriage to the five Pandavas was one of such questions treated in the said Purana.

Two other Puranas have discussed the identical topic, so far as I know at present. The Brahma Vairavatha Purana and the Devi-Bhagavata Purana. I propose to give here, in brief, the explanations offered

in these Puranas. They are absurd on the face of them and require no effort to demolish them. It is therefore not necessary to comment on them in detail. And yet, one thing should not be lost sight of. The Puranas are all of the authorship of Vyasa. He was himself an Avatar or next in rank. Whatever he has recorded in the Puranas must be the truth, if not the whole truth. The Purana cannot certainly contain anything that is not true. The account of the same incident or topic might vary in each Purana, even to the extent of manifesting glaring and irreconcilable contradictions. There may be a dozen varying accounts of a particular matter. But, all the same, they are all true, one and all of them, for, they are all equally the productions of Vyasa. There is the further consideration that in each case the story will be found to be only a transcript of a narration by Siva to Parvati, or Vishnu to Lakshmi or Vishnu to Brahma and so on. It is plain to all reason and good sense that the creators of the universe and the great Rishis cannot be credited with uttering what is not true. We need not, therefore, doubt the authenticity of the matters recorded, whether we believe in the genuineness of the writing or not.

The story as given in the Markandeya Purana, Chapter 5:

(1) When the Indra slew the son of Thwashta, he incurred the sin of Brahmahatya. One consequence of this was that his vitality diminished. (But nothing is lost when a candle burns). To the extent of the abatement in the Indra, there was an increase in the bodily strength of Dharma (Pluto).

(2) On a second occasion the Indra underwent a

similar change when he slew Vritra and incurred Brhama-hatya over again. The virility that he lost, this time, went to augment the potency of Vayu, the Wind-God.

(3) The Indra does not appear to have drawn any lessons from adversity for his own use or guidance.

He got into trouble again when he seduced Ahalya, the chaste wife of Gotama, a great Rishi. He paid the penalty of his offence by the loss of his manhood to some extent. What he lost went to enrich the Aswins.

(4) Now it so happened that all the Asuras killed by the Indra and the Gods re-incarnated themselves in the forms of Duryodhana, his brothers, friends and followers. They had to be destroyed over again by the Gods or their duplicates. Yudhishtira was incarnated by that portion of the Indra's manhood which entered the body of Dharma. Bhima was likewise produced by Vayu or the Wind-God. The Twins, Nakula and Sahadeva were created by a similar strain. Arjuna was directly generated by the Indra as the embodiment of a moiety of himself. All these were, individually, reproductions of the Indra, real, though fractional. For, says the Purana:—

योगीश्वराश्शरीराणि कुर्वन्ति बहुलान्यपि.

‘Those who are masters of Yoga can multiply their bodies into several.’

The Purana adds that Draupadi was no other than the incarnation of the Indra's Queen. This is intelligible, for, the Indra having reproduced himself as the five Pandavas, his Queen reappears as Draupadi and perforce becomes their common consort.

The Brahma-Vaiṣarta-Purana, Book II, Chapter 116.

“At that time, Agni disguised as a Brahmin paid a visit to Rama at Panchavati. The God said to the Avatar. ‘You must find a way of secreting Sita. Within seven days Ravana will come and take her away by force. It is predestined and cannot be avoided. It is fate and destiny’. Then spoke Rama. ‘You take Sita with you and retire, but let her shadow remain here’. Agni departed taking Sita with him. The shadow stood before Rama. It was this shadow that was seized by Ravana and abducted. When Ravana was slain, this ‘shadowy-Sita’ was recovered. It was this shadow that was subjected to the ordeal by fire, at the very moment, that Agni restored the real Sita to Rama. Rama took his departure accompanied by the real Sita. The disappointed shadow stood for a time by the side of Agni, in great dejection. The shadow departed to Lake Narayana and there made Tapas to Sankara for the period of a hundred *divine* years. At last the God Sankara appeared before her and said ‘what do you want?’ The shadow-Sita replied with great earnestness and desire. ‘Give me a husband’. This prayer was repeated five times. The God was pleased and said, ‘Chaste woman, you have, in your mental uneasiness, asked for a husband five times. Five Indras will be your lovers’. The five Indras are now the five Pandavas. The shadow of Sita now appears as the fire-born Draupadi. In the Krita Yuga she was Vedavati; in the Treta Yuga she was Sita, in the Dwapara Yuga she was Draupadi, and hereafter she will be Swarga-Lakshmi or the divine Royalty of the Indras. The king gave away the damsel to Arjuna at the tournament.

Arjuna reported to his mother that on that day he got an excellent gift from somebody, but did not say what the gift was or by whom given. The mother replied in all innocence, ‘Share the gift with your brothers.’ Draupadi was thus mated with five husbands, first by the decree of the God Sankara and next by the declaration of the mother.”

The Devi-Bhagavata, Book (Skandha) IX, Chapter 16.

The Devi-Bhagavatam gives a ‘true account’ of the previous incarnations of Draupadi and of the why and the wherefore of her marriage to five husbands at one and the same time. In the Krita Yuga it is recorded that two Princes named Kusadhwaja and Dharmadhwaja, brothers of full blood, lived in peace though in poverty. They were of royal blood and had a glorious ancestry. Their poverty was due to the circumstance that they had to atone, by their indigence and obscurity, for the transgressions of a lineal ancestor, who flourished some generations before. The law was inexorable. The sins of the ancestor were visited on the descendants. The ancestor was a ruling prince. He lost his kingdom and sovereignty by the curse of the Sun-God and what was lost was not recovered even in the sixth generation of descent. The tribulation inflicted on the dynasty does not appear to have been quite deserved or at all commensurate with the offence of the fallen monarch.

His sin was that he was a staunch devotee of the God Siva. He acknowledged no other God. At least, he worshipped none other. This persuasion of the king gave great offence to the Sun-God, whose inclinations

were probably in favour of preferring Vishnu either as 'par excellence' or as 'Inter Pares.' The irate God pronounced the curse and it was duly worked out.

In course of time, Vishnu, as a merciful God, took pity on the brothers named above and allowed that they should be restored to their own. The dynasty was accordingly restored and the princes were enthroned in regal state.

The grace of Vishnu where it descends does so in abundance. It was vouchsafed that the Queen of Kusadhawaja should give birth to a daughter, of divine essence, as a fractional incarnation of the Goddess Lakshmi.

Kusadhawaja's daughter was named Vedavati as, the moment she was born, she started reciting the Vedas. From the confinement chamber of her mother the princess passed straight to the forest to make Tapas. She was there making Tapas for a whole Manvantara. At the end of that period she heard a voice from above, which said that in another birth she would have Vishnu himself as her husband. This assurance did not put an end to her travail. For some reason, not apparent, she started Tapas over again, on the mountains of Gandha-madana. Ravana, the Ruler of Lanka, in one of his rambles turned up there. She offered him hospitality which was accepted but wickedly requited. The Asura was smitten with her charms; he seized her by the hand and offered rude caresses. The inviolate and immaculate virgin pronounced a curse on him that he should some day come to perdition on her account. She said this and, considering her mortal body as defiled by the touch of the Asura, she gave up the ghost. Ravana

consigned the lifeless body to the waters of the Ganges and wept much, but whether from contrition or from disappointment, the Purana does not state.

The next birth which was foretold for Vedavati came about in the next Yuga *i.e.*, the second or Treta Yuga. She appeared as Sita, the wife of Rama, the Avatar of Vishnu.

• Shortly before the time came for her abduction by Ravana, Agni appeared before Rama as the trusted messenger of the Gods, in the form of an old Brahmin. He proposed to Rama that Sita should be handed over to him for safe-keeping, that Rama should have with him the shadow of Sita, animate and twin-like. This shadowy duplicate of Sita was then manufactured by Agni, and made to look like Sita. The real Sita was taken away by Agni and the shadow was duly installed in her place. The whole thing was so cleverly managed that even Lakshmana knew nothing of the matter and he believed almost to the end that the shadow was the reality. It was this shadowy-Sita that was seized and led away by Ravana. After the asura was slain, the substitute-Sita was recovered and was made to pass through the ordeal by fire. At that moment the real Sita was surrendered by Agni to Rama. The substitute now found her occupation gone and wished to know of Rama and Agni what else she could do for them. Then the two divine ones said. 'Go lady to Pushkarakshetra and make Tapas. At the end of it you shall become स्वर्गलक्ष्मी: the 'Glory of Swarga'. She obeyed and made Tapas for three hundred thousand years, at the end of which period she became स्वर्गश्री:. In the next Yuga, however, she appeared again as 'Draupadi'. But how did it

happen that as Draupadi she had five husbands? When the shadowy Sita was directed to make Tapas in Pushkara, she made the Tapas to Sankara; and, when the God revealed himself to her,

‘Impelled by strong sexual desire and badly in want of a husband, she repeatedly asked for a husband, five times, saying ‘give me a husband, ‘give me a husband’ and so on. The God heard the prayer and in a gamesome mood said to her “my dear, *You shall have five husbands*”.

That is how she became the common wife of the Pandavas.

[It is possible that the Tapas had clothed the shadow with flesh and blood, for, it is difficult to understand that a mere shadow or a photographic likeness should be in distress by reason of carnal desires, however life-like and animated it may appear.] This story was narrated by Narayana (Vishnu) to Narada and its truth is therefore beyond question.

The authors responsible for the first form of the Bharata would not have invented this incident of Draupadi’s, in defiance of the usages of the times in which they lived or of their knowledge of history, unless the tradition of the story were very strong to that effect, and had been handed down to the generation in which they lived almost in the form in which they put it. At the time when the poetic effort about this epic was started, society may have had at least a faint recollection that such marriages were in vogue at a remote period and they were probably prepared to accept the story, as related, on the strength of a living tradition. But later

generations, having completely lost touch with the traditions of remote periods of antiquity, found this marriage as something not known among men or Gods, something the *Raison d’être* of which they were not able to appreciate.

Explanations were wanted and supplied but with what success the reader will judge.





## Corrigenda.

PAGE	LINE	FOR	READ
24	5	कश्चिदेतस्य	कश्चिदेतस्य
28	24	'from'	form
32	23	पुष्प	पुष्प
"	3	fifty	150
45	1	Suka's	this
60	4	प्रीतः	प्रीताः
62	24	Duryodhana	Bhimasena
66	20	to cure of a colic Agni.	to cure Agni of a colic.
72	30	successes	some successes
78	26	संशे	शंसे
89	17	centemporaries	contemporaries
156	9	परिक्षित्	परीक्षित्
178	"	वसिष्ठेन	वसिष्ठेन
"	13	शङ्ख	शङ्ख
"	18	केशवे	केशव
180	20	Draupadies	Draupadi's
184	3	clotht	cloth
193	22	जयधर्म	जयधर्म
205	12	adaventures	adventures
227	19	Padavas	Pandavas
230	10	hundered	hundred
257	13	Kanna	Karna
289	22	Kunt	Kunti
304	19	Yudhishtira	Yudhishtira

## THE INDEX.

(Not exhaustive).

THE REFERENCES ARE TO PAGES.

<b>Adiparva</b> —Discussion of canto-titles and contents, re-iterations &c., ...	120, 121; 152 to 165.
<b>Adivamsavataranam</b> —This title preferred to Amsavataranam ...	154.
<b>Agnis</b> —The Pedigree of.....in Vanaparva, not warranted ...	220
<b>Alberuni's Indika</b> —List of the 18 Books of the Mahabharata quoted and discussed ...	329 to 334
<b>Animandavyopakhyanam</b> —not referred to in Parvasangraha ...	163
<b>(Antah) parvas</b> —105. Enumeration of ...	107 to 109
—Discussed in connection with postscripts.	112 to 134
<b>Anugitaparva</b> —not mentioned in parvasangraha ...	284
<b>Anusasanikaparva</b> —not mentioned by Brahma ...	27
—Character of text discussed ...	280 et seq;
<b>Aranyakaparva</b> —see Vanaparva ...	...
<b>Asramavasikaparva</b> —Discussion about ...	288 et seq;
—one chapter noted for.....shifted to the next Book ...	291 to 292
<b>Astikaparva</b> —16; Refutation of claim of...as starting point of Bharata text ...	20—21
—Extent of text of...criticised from data in parvasangraha ...	156
—An interpolation leading to absurdities ...	352 to 360

<b>Aswamedhaparva</b> —Discussion about...started	...	282 et seq
—Revised by later writers	...	Do.
—Interpolation in...of Vaishnava...		
Dharmaparva, in Dravida text	...	283
—False postscripts in	...	285

**Appendixes**—See table of contents.

I (1) Pandu killing Kindama Rishi, an astronomical myth	...	361—362
I (2) Bhishma on the stretcher...explained as the astronomical fable of Aditya-sayana	...	363—364
I (3) The number 18 of the Books of the Mahabharata...Ritualistic	...	365—366
II Draupadi and her five husbands. Examination of the justifications invented for D's five husbands...	...	366 to 415

**B**

<b>Bakasura</b> —killed by Bhima	...	63—83
<b>Bhagavadgita</b> —a fifth-hand discourse	...	248
<b>Bhishma</b> —killed in battle, yet living	...	249
—on the stretcher...see Appendix I (2).	...	363—364
<b>Brahma</b> —(The creator), Interview with Vyasa; their conversation...discussion anent the Bharata	...	22 to 26
Ramayana parallel	...	23
Interview not mentioned in Telugu	...	
<b>Bharata (Mahabharata)</b> Printed editions available	1	
Great extent of variations among them of text, sequence &c.,	...	2, 12, 22, 34, 37, 50, 51
—Want of proper commentaries on	...	2
—Different styles of composition intermingled	...	2
—As the fifth Veda	...	3
—A sort of encyclopædia	...	3, 28, 24...
—Attempts in research of present day scholars	...	4

( <i>Bha:con-</i> ) —Introduced in Puranic style	...	4—5
—Regarded as a Purana	...	6
—Contents of...(in general)	...	8, 23, 24, 25, 39
—Recital by Sauti	...	8—9
—By others	...	9—10
—Suggestions in first chapter that ...was ancient, even in Sauti's time...	...	9
—Repetitions of topics in...sought to be justified	...	16—17
—Commencement of...as noted in a text...discussion thereon	...	15, 17 to 22
—Mentioned as a Kavya to Brahma by Vyasa and discussion thereof	...	24—25
—Described by Brahma as a tree by metaphor	...	27
—Division of...into parvas	...	26—27
—Dictation of...by Vyasa to Ganesa (the God), and the theory about 8800 hard verses	...	30 to 32
—Corruption of the text;...tree-metaphor	...	32 to 34
—Original number of slokas of...stated as 60 lakhs	...	35, 36, 37, 43
—A synopsis of the incidents in	...	38
Absence of notice of Vana and Virataparva incidents in the above synopsis discussed	...	70, 72, 75, 78
—not published at the Court of Parikshit	...	39
—upakhyānams...75000 slokas	...	40
—Ganesa's copy of...not shown or given to Janamejaya	...	42—43
Absence in the synopsis of mention of incidents from Varanavatayatra...to Swayamvaram...effect of same discussed	...	60 to 65

( <i>Bharata: contd</i> ) Likewise of the incidents from Swa- yamvara to Rajasuya	...	66—67
—The तदनाश्रित series of Verses in...an interpolation;	... ..	
the series discussed; positive and negative results	... ..	78 to 90
—Successfully weighed in the balance against the four Vedas	... ..	94, 95, 96
—Telugu translation of...introduced and the method of the translators ex- plained	... ..	97, 98, 99
—Probable origin of the 1st chapter of	...	100
Probable interpolations in the first chapter of	... ..	102
—suggestions about the original text, the story, the sub-division &c., of the ...deducible from a study of the 1st chapter	... ..	102, 103, 104
—Original division of...only into can- toes	... ..	107, 118, 119, 147
—Division by postscripts into } cantoos only	... ..	97, 98 or 100 143
—Division into Books...not Vyasa's idea	... ..	147
see also	... ..	329 to 334
—narrative of...really closes with the incidents of the eleventh Book	... ..	131 324, 325
—The authorship of the Books of...by } Vyasa, discussed	... ..	314 to 329; 346 et seq;
see also	... ..	11, 15, 22, 35

( <i>Bharata: contd.</i> ) Recitation by Vyasa as Rhapsodist.	335, 336
—Several independent versions of..... story, composed severally by Vyasa's pupils	... .. 349, 350
—Count of chapters, cantoos, slokas of ....., as stated in Sanskrit Parva- sangraha, Telugu Parvasangraha, and as actually found in some of the existing texts	... .. 310 et seq :
same as contained in C 62	... 346
Discussion thereon	... 347 et seq

## C

<b>Cantoos (Antahparvas)</b> —Enumeration of.....by Sauti	... .. 107
—Discussion of the fact that 130..... are enumerated and averred as 100,...	108, 109
—number of.....discussed	... 112 to 117
—Allocation of.....to the several } Books	... .. 118 et seq to 135
—Comparison of the Sanskrit enumer- ation with the corresponding Telugu rendering and discussion thereon	... 138—139
.....Variation in sequence of.....as be- tween the Sanskrit enumeration and the actual order obtaining in the texts	... .. 141—142

<b>Copy</b> —into the Mahabharata of entire chapters and cantoos from Puranas...Instances.	
.....of matter from Padmapurana	... 213—217
or Matsyapurana.	
.....of matter from Matsya or Skanda	... 232

## D

<b>Death of the Avatars</b> —Bala and Krishna and of the Yadavas	... .. 292, 293, 294
.....Pandavas	... .. 298

## VI

<b>Dharmavyadha chapters</b> —The.....of Vanaparva, a late interpolation ... ..	226
<b>Discussion</b> —of the canto titles and sangraha detail. .....of the 1st Book started ... ..	152
.....of the 2nd Book ... ..	166—167
.....of the 3rd Book ... ..	207
.....of the 4th Book ... ..	236
.....of the 5th Book ... ..	240
.....of the 6th Book ... ..	245
.....of the 7th Book ... ..	253
.....of the 8th Book ... ..	257
.....of the 9th Book ... ..	260
.....of the 10th Book ... ..	261
.....of the 11th Book ... ..	266
.....of the 12th Book ... ..	271
.....of the 13th Book ... ..	280
.....of the 14th Book ... ..	281
.....of the 15th Book ... ..	288
.....of the 16th Book ... ..	292
.....of the 17th Book ... ..	297; & 301 at seq.
.....of the 18th Book ... ..	299; & 301 et seq.
<b>Discussion of chapters</b> —50, 60, 61, 62 of the Bha- rata ... ..	334 to 351, 340
<b>Draupadi</b> —won by Arjuna at the tournament ... ..	60, 79, 80, 81
——modesty of.....outraged ... ..	70
——abduction of...by Jayadratha ... ..	231
——and her five husbands. Appendix II. ... ..	366 to 415
<b>Draupadivastrapaharanam episode examined</b> ... ..	167 to 201
<b>Dyutam</b> —once or twice? Discussed ... ..	85 to 89

## VII

<b>Dwaraka</b> —Submersion of.....not stated in the Parvasangraha ... ..	96
<b>G</b>	
<b>Ganesa</b> —(The God), as Vyasa's amanuensis ... ..	23, 24, 28, 29, 30
——Copy made by.....probably of the Bharata of 24,000 slokas ... ..	
——His copy of Bharata ... ..	42, 43, 339,
<b>Geographical chapters in Bhishmaparva</b> —Inter- polation by copy from Padmapurana. ... ..	250
<b>Ghoshayatra</b> —In Vanaparva. Relevancy discussed. ... ..	227
<b>Greek fable</b> ...Probable.....Kichaka done to death by Bhimasena ... ..	90
<b>H</b>	
<b>Harivamsa</b> ... ..	110...111
<b>Hastinapura</b> ...Entry of the Pandavas into ... ..	50
<b>Hewitt. J. F.</b> ...History and Chronology of the myth- making age ... ..	14
<b>I</b>	
<b>Incognito</b> —period of the Pandavas ... ..	88
<b>Indra's</b> —battle with Arjuna and delivery of Astras. ... ..	67
<b>Indralokabhigamanam</b> —Canto of—in the 3rd ... ..	
Book...no justification for ... ..	211
.....2nd and 3rd visits of Arjuna to Indraloka not noticed in the Parva- sangraha, ... ..	221
<b>J</b>	
<b>Jalapradanikam</b> ...Canto of the 10th Book shifted to the 11th ... ..	262 to 266
<b>Janamejaya's</b> ...Scepticism of Vyasa's capacity to conjure up visions. ... ..	289/290
.....This incident not known to the Parva- sangraha, ... ..	290

## K

<b>Kamsa...</b>	...	110
<b>Karna...</b> Disclosures of parentage to...made by Kunti		241
.....Attempts to seduce from allegiance to Duryodhana made by Krishna and the Sun-God,	...	290
<b>Karna and Achilles...</b>	...	255
<b>Karnaparva...</b> Absence of division into cantoes of... dwelt on,	...	257-258
.....appears to have been revised and re-written	...	259
<b>Khandava...</b> Conflagration and connected incidents...		66-79.
<b>Kichaka...</b> Gets into trouble with Draupadi	...	71.
.....Done to death by Bhima	...	88-89.
.....Brothers of.....killed by Bhima, an interpolated story	...	230
<b>Krishna...</b> Kills Sisupala	...	65
.....At the Khandava conflagration.	...	66-67.
.....Rushes out to slay Bhishma.	...	251-252.
<b>Kunti...</b> Her disclosures to Karna.	...	241
<b>Kurukshetra...</b> Battle-field of.....6.	...	82
.....Sauti's return from...	...	107

## M

<b>Mahabharata...</b> see Bharata.		
.....origin of name	...	94
<b>Mahaprasthanikam...</b> Discussion about canto-titles and text	...	297.
.....a chapter of...shifted backward from the 18th Book.	...	299.
<b>Machinery...</b> divided by Vyasa for the narration of the incidents of the war contemporaneously	...	246-247

<b>Markandeyasamasya</b> —Largely added to	...	222
——About 8 Upakhyanyams of.....not named in the parvasangraha	...	224
<b>Mausalaparva</b> —Discussion about	...	292 et seq.

## N

<b>Nannaya Bhatta</b> —...Telugu poet	...	97
<b>NivataKavachaYuddha</b>	...	220/221
<b>Nalayani episodes discussed</b> —Appendix II.		

## P

<b>Panchendropakhyanam</b> —Discussed	...	385. et seq.
<b>Pandavas</b> —Genealogy of—18. Birth of.....Before or after Pandu's death discussed	...	48 to 51
——Entry of.....into Hastinapura	...	50 - 52;
Discussion of the events subsequent		54-59
——Their adolescence. Discussion as to the truth of the alleged persecutions in this period by Duryodhana	...	60 to 65
——History of.....from time of entry into Hastinapuram to their removal to Varanavatam, not referred to in the Parvasangraha.	...	162
<b>Pandu</b> —Episode of the curse of the Rishi and birth of Pandavas	...	48 to 50
——The above episode astronomically explained. Appendix I (1)	...	361-362.
——manner of his death. Criticism and discussion	...	50-56
<b>Pandya's daughter</b> —married to Arjuna	...	344/345
<b>Parikshit</b> —Cursed by Sringi	...	53
——son of Abhimanyu	...	67
<b>Parvas (Books)</b> —Division into 26-27. List of	...	329 - 311
——such division not mentioned by Vyasa to Brahma	...	27
——Last seven.....spurious	...	83

<b>Parva</b> (Anusasana) —not found in Brahma's enumeration, ... ..	27
(Mahaprasthana) ... ..	
(Swargarohana) ... ..	
<b>Parvas</b> (Cantos). Allocation of.....to the several Books discussed... ..	118 to 134.
—such allocation changed from time to time. ... ..	131
<b>Parvanukramanika or Preliminary enumeration.</b>	
—Discussion and Criticism of ... ..	107 to 117
—As the name of the present first chapter, a misnomer ... ..	135
—Compared with Telugu ... ..	137 to 140
—Telugu author's method explained ... ..	137
—Sequence of cantos given in..... generally in accord with arrangement in text, cases contra ... ..	141, 142.
—Telugu translator's position ... ..	143 to 146
—Discussion as to how Telugu comes to vary from Sanskrit here ... ..	145
—Verification at the end of...discussed... ..	146 et seq.
—Results of the discussion about ... ..	147, 148-149
<b>Parvasangraha</b> —Portion of the second chapter, introduced ... ..	118
—Sanskrit, method of.....explained ... ..	150/309/106
—Telugu ... ..	151
—Sanskrit...For Adiparva, criticism of, ... ..	152
—discussion of Amsavataranam and Vamsavataranam, ... ..	153, 154
—account of Sambhavarparva discussed ... ..	159
—account of the Sabhaparva discussion started ... ..	166
—Colophons or verifications, cited and discussed ... ..	309 et seq.

<b>Pativratamahatmyam</b> —identity of...discussed with reference to Parvasangraha and parvanukramanika notices... ..	224-225
<b>Polyandrous marriages</b> —instances of ... ..	
<b>Postscripts</b> —The...Their want of accordance with the Parvanukramanika ... ..	120
—Discussion of ... ..	120 to 135
<b>Prayopavesanam</b> —incidents of Duryodhana's...not referred to in Parvasangraha ... ..	229 - 230
<b>Preliminary enumeration</b> —see Parvanukramanika..	
<b>Punardhyutam</b> ... ..	85
<b>Puranic character of the Bharata</b> — ... ..	111

## R

<b>Rajasuya</b> —sacrifice by Yudhishtira ... ..	64-65
<b>Ramayana</b> The—Referred to ... ..	10
<b>Ramopakhyana</b> —In the Bharata ... ..	231
<b>Re-iterations</b> —In the Bharata, reason for...in general explained ... ..	158
.....in the first Book... ..	165
.....in the second Book ... ..	206
<b>Results of the study of the first chapter summarised</b> ... ..	100 to 103
.....discussion contained in pages ... ..	104 to 147
summarised, ... ..	147-148-149
<b>Results of the discussion as to the text of</b>	
.....2nd Book ... ..	207
.....3rd Book ... ..	234 - 235
.....5th Book ... ..	245
.....6th Book ... ..	253
.....7th Book ... ..	257
.....8th Book ... ..	259 - 260
.....9th Book ... ..	261
.....10th Book ... ..	265

Result of the discussion as to the text of

.....11th Book	...	...	271
.....12th & 13th Books	...	...	282
.....14th Book	...	...	288
.....15th Book	...	...	292
.....16th Book	...	...	297
.....17th & 18th Books	...	...	301

**Results of the discussion as to Vyasa's authorship of the 18 Books** ... 327 - 328.

### S

<b>Sagaropakhyana</b> —in Vanaparva, no reference to....	...	...	217
in parvasangraha	...	...	217
<b>Sakuntaladushyantopakhyanam</b>	...	...	159
.....Changing places with Yayatyupakhyana in the copies	...	...	159
.....not mentioned in the preliminary enumeration	...	...	160
.....Probable interpolation of	...	...	160 - 161
.....no notice in Telugu Parvasangraha...	...	...	160 - 161
<b>Samantapanchaka</b> —	...	...	6 - 105
<b>Sambhavaparva</b> detail of.....in parvasangraha discussed	...	...	159
<b>Sanjaya</b> —disciple of Vyasa	...	...	29
—adviser of Dhritarashtra	...	...	69
—Dhritarashtra's talk with	...	...	73-74
<b>Santiparva</b> —some cantoes named for...missing	...	...	273
—some chapters taken from 11th Book and put into this have changed places	...	...	275, 276
—motive for shifting the aforementioned chapters from 11th to this Book suggested	...	...	278 - 279
—nature of contents of...outlined	...	...	279
more chapters in...in Dravida than elsewhere	...	...	280

**Saugandhika**—quest for, re-iterated under another name ... 219

**Saunaka** ... 5 - 6 - 7

**Sauti** The ... 5 - 6 - 7

.....Introduces himself to the Rishis to recite stories to them ... 7

requested to recite the Bharata ... 7-8

Prefatory matter by...criticised ... 9,10;14 to 22,

Recitation to Saunaka ... 46-47

**Savitryupakhyana** In Vanaparva, copied from Matsyapurana or Skanda ... 235

**Simhabala** (Kichaka) ... 89

**Skandapala** Killed by Krishna at Rajasuya ... 65

**Skandopakhyana**—In Vanaparva not warranted by Parvasangraha ... 226

**Spurious** character of the last seven Books of the Bharata ... 339

**Striparva** some cantoes of...removed to the 12th Book and there treated as chapters not cantoes ... 266, 267, 268.

some chapters of...change places ... 269 - 270

**Strivillapa** on the battle field, idea of later Bharata specialists ... 263-264  
265-268

**Subhadra** elopes with Arjuna ... 66 - 79

**Suta** caste of ... 6

**Swargarohanaparva**—Discussion of ... pp 299 et seq;

Variation between Parvasangraha notices and text of ... 300

**Synopsis** of the Bharata story...as given in the first instance in the first chapter...set out and discussed ... pp 48 et seq  
as again recorded in the same chapter in the तदनाशंसे series of slokas...set out and discussed, ... pp 80 et seq

## U

**V**

(Variation :)—Between the notes of Parvasangraha and the text of Swargarohanaparva...	299
.....Between the sanskrit Parvasangraha of the last two Books and the Telugu Parvasangraha of the same Books ...	301 et seq
.....in the number of Adhyayas, cantoes, slokas &c ... ..	311 - 312
.....Between the reckoning of slokas as given in the Sanskrit Parvasangraha and the Telugu Parvasangraha ...	310-311-312
.....of text and sequence in 2nd Book ...	201 to 207
.....of text and sequence in 3rd Book ...	233
....." " 8th " ...	259
<b>Varuna</b> - Gives arms to Arjuna ... ..	66-67
<b>Virataparva</b> —Incidents of.....Left out in the first summary of the first chapter.....Discussion ... ..	70 to 72
<b>Yyasa</b> ...His authorship of the Bharata 11-12-35; 313 to 328; 346 to 349 discussed .....	
.....His interview with Brahma ...	23
<b>Yyasa's pupils</b> ...each composing a Bharata of his own	349/350
<b>Y</b>	
<b>Yakshaprasna</b> ...a re-iteration of the idea of Ajagaram ... ..	233
<b>Yayatyupakhyanam</b> ...copied entire from Matsya (or Padma) Purana, ... ..	159
.....not mentioned in Parvanukramanika-	160
.....and Sakuntalopakhyanam change places in the copies ... ..	159
.....probable interpolation ... ..	160 - 161
<b>Yudhishtira</b> ...at Varanavata 62, at the Dyutam ...	85
.....Sermons to.....by Brothers, wife, Vyasa and Krishna ... ..	275
.....goes up in the flesh to swarga in a divine chariot ... ..	299



